



100  
225  
200

Brandeis University  
Library



*In Honor of*

GRANT ELLIS FRIED

A  
T R E A T I S E  
ON  
INFANT BAPTISM.

PROVING,

*From the scriptures, that Infants are proper subjects of Baptism, were so considered by the apostles, and did receive that ordinance under their ministry.*

---

---

BY ISAAC CLINTON,  
Pastor of a Church in Southwick

---

---

*Search the scriptures.—John 5. 39.*

*These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind and searched the scriptures daily whether these things were so.—Acts 17. 11.*

*In the latter days ye shall consider it perfectly.  
Jer. 23. 20.*

---

---

SPRINGFIELD :  
PRINTED BY HENRY BREWER.

.....  
Copyright secured.

Rare Books  
x B1813  
C55

---

## P R E F A C E.

*THERE is no doctrine of the Christian faith which depends wholly on revelation, but has had zealous opposers, who have interpreted scripture to favour their own notions.*

*How much has been said by Socinians against the divinity of Christ—by Armenians against the saints' perseverance—by Antinomians against the necessity of a holy life—by Universalists against a future punishment, and by Quakers against water baptism and the Lord's Supper? More scripture is brought to oppose these doctrines (which we still believe to be true) than can be brought to oppose infant baptism. We may then as well give up any doctrine of the Christian faith, which depends wholly on revelation, as to give up infant baptism.*

*In the following work, reference is often made to the Septuagint, i. e. the Greek translation of the Old Testament, because the apostles in quoting the Old Testament scriptures, literally from the Septuagint, have given undeniable testimony that they use Greek words in the same sense. In this way their hearers who were familiarly acquainted with the Septuagint would expect to understand them.*

*It has been the writer's aim, to benefit the common reader, rather than the learned. On this account, he has sought to render the following work easy to be understood, and has chosen*

to express Greek words in the same letters as we express our own. The common reader is further informed, that as from the English verb baptize, come several variations, as baptizest, baptizeth, baptized, baptizedst, baptizing, &c: So from the Greek verb baptizo come several variations, &c: which retain the same meaning as their root, baptize or baptizo.

For the reason before mentioned we will explain the meaning of the following words.

**Baptist**, one who baptizes or believes in the duty of baptism. Any denomination using baptism may with propriety be called baptists.

**Pedo-baptist**, one who baptizes infants.

**Anabaptist**, one who rebaptizes.

**Antipedo-baptist**, one who denies infant baptism.

**Sprinkling baptist**, one who administers baptism by sprinkling.

**Dipping baptist**, one who administers baptism by dipping, &c.

If the writer knows his own heart he is moved to offer the following pages to public perusal, not from any personal prejudice, but from a love to the truth.

He feels a Spirit of candour, and wishes to promote christian charity. His most affectionate prayer is, reader, that thou mayest read without prejudice, and that Christ may enlighten thee into the knowledge of thy duty by his holy word and Spirit.

---

## SECTION I.

### THE SUBJECT INTRODUCED.

#### MARK x. 14.

*But when Jesus saw it he was much displeas'd, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God.*

**T**HE doctrine of Infant Baptism (as it appears from the history of the church) has been received, from the primitive age of the church, until now. It was first denied in France by Peter De Bruis, about the year 1103. This man asserted that infants were not capable of salvation and on that account ought not to be baptized. He had only a few followers, and his sect soon became extinct. It was next denied in Germany, by a sect called Anabaptists, about the year 1522.

This controversy has made a greater breach in the church of Christ than almost any other. On one side it is maintained, that the infants of believers have a right to visible membership in the church, and are proper subjects of baptism, the seal of the cove-

nant. On the other side, they deny this doctrine, and endeavor to maintain that baptism, when administered, to the children of believers, is not valid. They deny communion with us at the Lord's table and say our visible standing in the church, is a mere nullity. They make no difference in this respect between us and heathen, and say Christ has no church on earth, but in their denomination. If we invite them to our communion, or request the privilege of coming to theirs ; they reply, How can we commune with unbaptized persons? To support their principles they say ; The covenant with Abraham was either a covenant of works or else a political institution,—We have no command in the New-Testament to baptize children,—Infants cannot exercise faith which is the condition of all Gospel privileges,—They have not sufficient capacities for covenant transactions,—No person can be brought into covenant but by his own personal knowledge and consent,—The gospel church was an institution entirely new, and contains believing adults only.

On the side of infant baptism we say ; The covenant made with Abraham was the covenant of Grace, and the church of God in every age of the world, as to its visibility, is built upon it,—Infants were included in that covenant, and brought into visible relation to God, and God's people,—This being



done by express order of God himself, destroys every argument founded on their incapacity and want of personal knowledge,—Christ has acknowledged the membership of infants in his church,—Believers under the gospel are brought into Abraham's covenant, and must walk in the steps of his faith.

Infants need and are capable of sanctification and salvation, the things signified by baptism,—God has a right to bring them into a visible covenant relation with himself, and lay them under covenant obligation and has actually done it,—We have the evidence of church history, that the practice of baptizing infants was derived from the Apostles and was never denied until the times before mentioned in France and Germany. It is true, several historians mention plunging as a mode frequently practised in the early ages of the church ; but those who used plunging, did plunge their infants, according to the testimony of the same writers. In either case the infants of believers were baptized.

This controversy having made so wide a breach in the church of Christ, the subject becomes important. Let us then with christian candor, in the fear of God, examine the subject, and search for the truth. Truth is always important, and what concerns us all to know. If our faith and practice is consistent with the word of God, if our ordinances are valid, if our standing in the

church is regular, it is a matter of importance that we should know it, and be steadfast in the truth ; if not it is a matter of equal importance that we be convinced of our error. Let truth stand and let error fall.

In order to obtain scripture evidence for the truth of doctrines and facts it is necessary to compare scripture with scripture, and sometimes it is necessary to make inferences. Testimony by a fair inference is always considered good testimony. It is often the case that we cannot from a single text discover all the truths contained in it, but when we compare it with other scriptures, the truths are clear. For instance, Christ tells the Jews, John 7. 22 : “ Moses gave unto you circumcision, (not because it was of Moses but of the fathers) and ye on the sabbath day circumsise a man. If a man on the Sabbath day receive circumcision, that the law of Moses should not be broken”, &c. When we compare this text with Gen. 17, we certainly know that Christ does not mean a man but an infant. Neither does he mean the law of Moses (strictly speaking) but the covenant with Abraham. That covenant required infants to be circumcised on the eighth day, which was often the Sabbath. And the only sense in which Moses gave them circumcision was this ; they depended on the authority of Moses for the truth, that God did make such a covenant with Abra-

ham. As a minister of God, and a faithful historian, he records that important transaction. Therefore they often call that covenant the law of Moses. The Jews were wont to call any thing the law of Moses, which was contained in his writings, and sanctioned by his authority. We also infer from these words of our Saviour that infant circumcision was in full practice when he spake them, and are as certain of the fact as though he had related all the circumstances of circumcising any number of infants. Neither does he speak of this, as a matter of wrong, but as a matter of right. The manner in which he relates it, at least implies a justification of the business.

---

## SECTION II.

*The covenant, which God made with Abraham, was the covenant of Grace.*

**G**OD said unto Abraham, Gen. 17. 1. "I am the Almighty God, walk before me and be thou perfect." And in verse 7. "I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee." Previous to this, God never had a visible church in

the world. There had been many believers in Christ, but no visible covenant relation to God, and to each other. And properly speaking there was no visible church. God requires of Abraham a sincere evangelical obedience, which is the fruit of an evangelical faith. So Christ says, Be ye perfect as your father which is in heaven is perfect. God promises to be a God unto Abraham, which is the greatest and most gracious promise made in any part of the Bible, and such as he never makes to any of the human race, only in and through a mediator. God then requires him to circumcise himself, and his household, and calls this the token of the covenant, 10 and 11 verses—"This is my covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee; Every man child among you shall be circumcised, and it shall be a token of the covenant between me and you." When God institutes a visible church, he appoints a token, a sacrament of admission. This the Apostle calls a seal of the righteousness of Abraham's faith.

The antipedo-baptists endeavour to confound the Abrahamic covenant with the ceremonial dispensation, with a view to prove, that as the one was abolished when Christ died, so the other must be also. There are no two things in the Bible more distinct than these; and none more clearly illustrated by the Apostles. Gal. 3. 17—"And this I say

that the covenant which was confirmed of God in Christ, the Law which was four hundred and thirty years after cannot disannul that it should make the promise of none effect." This passage teaches us, that the covenant made with Abraham was confirmed of God in Christ, and had no connexion with, nor reference to the ceremonial Law ; that the ceremonial Law was four hundred and thirty years after, and was a temporary business ;—but the covenant with Abraham was indissoluble in its nature having Christ for its foundation, and was never so completely realized as under this last dispensation of Gospel grace.

Elder Merrill says, page 67 " It is hence plain that the ceremonial law was to continue no longer." " The covenant of circumcision appears to be annexed to this Law."

Page 68 " It is hence plain, that the ceremonial Law is no longer binding, and that the covenant of circumcision which was incorporated with it, hath passed away."

The Law of ceremonies we all know is abolished. We have no dispute here. But to say the covenant of circumcision was annexed to this law, or hath passed away is grossly absurd.

How would it answer to say, the constitution of the United States was annexed to the law of internal taxation, or to a law which had no existence, until four hundred

and thirty years after the constitution was made, and when that law was repealed, the constitution became null and void? This would be shocking to all common sense! And to say the covenant made with Abraham, which was the constitution of the church, was annexed to the law of ceremonies, and became null and void, when that law was no longer in force, is equally absurd! For then God has ceased to be Abraham's God, and the promises to the believer and his seed are to be relied on no more!!!

Moreover, when one thing is annexed to another, the former cannot be annexed to the latter, but the latter to the former.

Again Mr. Merrill pretends, that the covenant made with Abraham, Gen. 17, was not the covenant which was confirmed of God in Christ. Page 68 "When Paul speaks of the covenant which was confirmed of God in Christ, he points out the exact year, when this was made known, or confirmed with Abraham. He tells us Gal. 3. 17, that this covenant, which cannot be made void, was four hundred and thirty years before the law, whereas, the covenant of circumcision was about four hundred and six years; before the law with which circumcision was united."

It is true, the dates of the bible make it about four hundred and thirty years, from the time when God appeared to Abraham,

Gen. 12. to the giving of the Law. And what then? What God proposed, or promised in the 12th chapter he did in the 17th renew, ratify and confirm by a fixed seal. It is evidently but one and the same covenant of grace, because the promises made to Abraham, and the conditions required of him, in each chapter, are for matter, and substance the same. Neither does Paul say, The confirmation was four hundred and thirty years before the law.

If the confirmation was delayed for the space of twenty three years after the covenant was proposed, that makes no difference, so long as it was confirmed, and circumcision was made the visible seal; and this Paul hath plainly told us. 2 Cor. 1. 20, "For all the promises of God in him (Christ Jesus) are yea; and in him Amen." Does not the 17th chapter contain promises, as well as the 12th? Rom. 4. 11. "And he received the sign of circumcision a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had." Was circumcision a seal of the righteousness of faith in Christ, and the covenant not confirmed in Christ? Rom. 15. 8. "Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision, for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers."

To deny, that the covenant, of which circumcision was the seal, was the covenant

confirmed of God in Christ, is to deny a plain bible truth, and make the apostle palpably contradict himself ; because, “ *All the promises are in Christ, yea and Amen.*” Circumcision is a seal of the righteousness of faith. And Christ is the minister of the circumcision. Circumcision, and the promises in Christ cannot be separated. Such a shift betrays a consciousness that they see lurking beneath the covenant of Abraham, a consequence most dreadful to their cause!!!

In this covenant, the Gospel was preached, Gal. 3. 8. “ The Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the Heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.” If then the Gospel, if Justification, if Christ, and his whole plan of redemption are essential articles in the covenant of grace, the covenant made with Abraham was the covenant of grace.

So long then as this covenant stands, and believing gentiles are brought into it, the divine right of infant baptism stands good. Was there not another argument in favour of it, the practice is to be justified.

The inference is fair and irresistible, that the same persons as were subjects of the seal, when the covenant was first instituted, are subjects of the seal now, and the same qualifications, as were once sufficient, are sufficient still.



---

---

### SECTION III.

*The Gospel dispensation is the fulfilment of the mercy covenanted to Abraham.*

**T**HE covenant made with Abraham is often said to be an everlasting covenant. As that covenant was confirmed of God in Christ, so the coming of Christ, and all the blessings of the Gospel were the fulfilment of the mercy promised in that covenant. Luke 1. 72, 73—"To perform the mercy promised to our fathers and to remember his holy covenant: The Oath which he sware to our father Abraham." It is evident from this passage that the coming of Christ, his ministry, his sufferings, his death and all the blessings of the Gospel dispensation are the fulfilment of the mercy covenanted to Abraham. The gentiles were promised to Abraham in that covenant. Gen. 17. 5. "A father of many nations have I made thee." This promise was fulfilled, when the gentiles believed in Christ, were brought into that Covenant, and walked in the steps of Abraham's faith. Hence we

find the Apostles frequently affirming that Abraham is the father of all them that believe. He is as much stiled the father of believing gentiles, as of believing Jews. The visible Church of God was first instituted in his family. He was the first believing head. And because all believers under the Gospel inherit the promises and privileges of the covenant made with him, he is said to be their father, and they are said to be his seed. He was placed at the head of the visible Church. Rom. 4. 11. "That he might be the father of all them that believe though they be not circumcised." Gal. 3. 7. "They which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham."—Verse 9. "They which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." Verse 14. "That the blessing of Abraham might come on the gentiles through Jesus Christ." 29, "And if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise."

What is it to have Abraham for our father? To be blessed with faithful Abraham? To have the blessing of Abraham come on us gentiles through Jesus Christ? To be Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise? What blessing had Abraham, in distinction from all other Saints, who lived before him? Answer this question, and you answer all the rest. Read the 17th chapter of Genesis and there you find what it was

Yet the antipedo-baptists say, the Covenant with Abraham was a Covenant of Works. Then a Covenant of works is come on the gentiles through Jesus Christ. Then are we blessed with faithful Abraham by being brought into a Covenant of Works. If we are Christ's then are we Abraham's seed, and heirs of a Covenant of Works.

These passages, which we have just mentioned, are plain and positive. They undeniably teach this truth, that the covenant made with Abraham stands unalterably the same. The blessing which Abraham had was the privilege of bringing his household into a covenant relation to God, under that gracious promise "I will be their God." The same is the privilege of every gentile believer. Some endeavor to evade the texts which we have just mentioned by saying, "The believer is only Abraham's *seed*, he is not Abraham. If he may baptize his children and bring them into covenant, it makes him *Abraham*, and this is more than Paul says he is. The believer is in the covenant himself but his children are not."

Such an interpretation is in itself a contradiction.—That covenant was made for believers and their households and will not *admit* the parent without the children. This is evident from the institution of the covenant. So when the gentile profelyte was received into that covenant, all his family

must be received. Exodus 12. 48. To say that the believer himself is the seed of Abraham and an heir according to the promise, and yet may not bring his children into covenant is a plain contradiction. The covenant admits no such thing ; but expressly requires that the household shall be included.

---

#### SECTION IV.

*Christ's visible Church, from its first institution, is ever the same.*

**T**HE covenant made with Abraham, as we have noticed before, was the institution of Christ's visible church in the world, which, from that time, has ever been one and the same. He had a church in the wilderness. There he was with them, and there they tempted him. Acts 7. 38. 1 Cor. 10. 9.

It is said, by our brethren, The covenant made with Abraham was at an end, when the Gospel dispensation took place, and a new church was instituted intirely on a new plan. They are indeed constrained to this, or else, to own the covenant interest of children, and their right to the seal.

Express scripture will shew us, that the covenant was perpetual, and the church now, the same as the church then. 1 Chron. 16. 15. "Be ye always mindful of his covenant; the word which he commanded to a thousand generations: *Even of the covenant* which he made with Abraham, and of his Oath which he sware unto Isaac; and hath confirmed the same to Jacob for a Law, and to Israelfor an everlasting covenant." Psalm 105. 8. is the same, so is Heb. 6. 13. 17.

Words cannot more strongly than these, express the perpetuity of the covenant. It is here, as elsewhere, expressly called an everlasting covenant, confirmed as a Law; confirmed in Christ, saith the apostle; made sure by the oath of God, by which God hath shewn the immutability of his counsel, saith the apostle again; commanded for a *thousand* generations. But, from Abraham to Christ was *only* forty-two generations, as we are informed in the first chapter of Matthew. The covenant made with Abraham then, must continue, nine hundred and fifty-eight generations after the birth of Christ, which will doubtless complete the age of the world. Here is plain Scripture, and a man may, as well deny the whole bible as to deny this. But, is not a definite number, sometimes used for an indefinite? Truly. But a thousand is never used for forty-two. When a thousand is used, for an indefinite number, it means as many as there be.

Job 9. 3. "He cannot answer him one of a thousand." The meaning is, one of all that he hath. Psalm 50. 10. "The cattle upon the thousand hills are mine." The meaning is all the hills, over all the world. So in these passages where the covenant of Abraham is said, to be commanded for a thousand generations, the meaning is an exact thousand, or else all the generations, from that time afterward to the end of the world.

Again God calls it the covenant of his peace, which shall endure longer than the mountains or the hills. Isaiah 54. 10. "For the mountains shall depart and the hills be removed : But my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord."

When Christ had addressed the Jews, in in the parable of the vineyard, with a particular reference to their visible church standing, and had made them pass sentence upon themselves, he then replied, Matt. 21. 43. "Therefore I say unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof."

This kingdom of God, which Christ said should be taken from the Jews, and given to the Gentiles, is the visible church state which they enjoyed.

The same, yes the very same church or kingdom, which he said should be taken

from the one, should be delivered to the other. And as this kingdom of God, the visible church, did embrace infants before and when it was taken from the Jews, so it must embrace infants, when given to the gentiles. Here also we have the express declaration of Christ. When they brought infants unto him, Luke 18. 15, and young children, Mark 10. 13. Jesus like Abraham's God (as in truth he was) treats them as the children of the covenant, and kingdom. He said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not for of such is the kingdom of God." He owns their covenant interest and approves their standing in the kingdom. He rebuked his disciples when they would forbid them; because if the parents belong to the kingdom, so do their infant offspring. "If the root be holy, so are the branches." The Scripture is plain and positive.

St. Paul, Rom. 11. confirms the idea, beyond a doubt, that the gentiles were united to the Jewish church. Christ did not take the kingdom suddenly from the Jews. Those, who received the Gospel, were not broken off, believing gentiles were added to, or incorporated with them; and the unbelieving Jews only were broken off.

Rom. 11. 17. "And if some of the branches were broken off, and thou (gentiles) wert grafted in among them and with them

(the Jews not broken off) partakeſt of the root, and fatneſs of the olive tree." "Grafted in contrary to nature," verſe 24.

The method of grafting is to take a cion, from a good tree, and graft it on a bad ſtock, and when grafted it bears the fruit of the tree from whence it is taken, and not the fruit of the ſtock on which it is grafted. But this grafting in of the gentiles is contrary. They are a bad cion taken from the wild olive grafted into a good ſtock, the Jewish church, and they bear the fruit of the ſtock, on which they are grafted. They take the place of thoſe who were broken off. But if at the commencement of the goſpel diſpenſation, as antipedo-baptiſts ſay, the former church and covenant were at an end, and a new church, to be erected it would be abſurd in the higheſt degree, to talk about being broken off becauſe of unbelief, and grafted in becauſe of faith. The apoſtle here has reference to a well known prophecy, which foretold, almoſt in the ſame words what had now come to paſs, Jer. 11. 16. "The Lord hath called thy name a green olive tree, fair and of goodly fruit: With the noiſe of a great tumult he hath kindled fire upon it and the branches are broken." The church is here called by God himſelf a green olive tree, fair and of goodly fruit. But behold! fire is kindled upon it, and ſome of the Jewish branches are broken off. This was one of



the most awful judgments ever inflicted. Great numbers, with their infant offspring, were now cast out of the church. The kingdom of God was taken from them. They were cut off from the means of grace, from the ordinances of communion with God, and the privileges of pleading the promises of the covenant. No wonder the prophet wept! No wonder Paul had great heaviness, and continual sorrow of heart.

But remember the trunk of the tree is not injured. And the branches were not all broken off. Many thousands remained, Acts 21. 20. God did not cast away his people whom he foreknew. And the branches, which were broken off, are yet to be grafted in again. Verse 24. "how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own Olive tree?" Into the same covenant standing, as they were in before they were broken off. When the Jews shall be converted, and enquire after their *Olive*, from whence they were broken off, will they be satisfied to hear the antipe-do-baptists say; "We and we *only* possess your Olive. You must unite with *us*. Other denominations baptize their children and receive them into the church. But children have no business in the church. To seal them with the righteousness of your faith is to seal a blank." Will the Jew I say be satisfied with this? No, with

disdain, he will reply ; “ This is not my  
 “ Olive ! The God of Abraham never taught  
 “ you this.”

A very candid good man, who for many years had been inclining to be an antipedobaptist, afterwards told me, how he was brought right again. “ I have been (said he) “ so much bewildered about infant baptism, “ that I never saw it no be right until I was “ brought to this spot. I saw that the church “ is the same now as under the former dispen- “ sation,—that the unbelieving Jews with “ their children were cast out,—that the be- “ lieving Jews were continued and conse- “ quently the standing of their children was “ not altered. And in the same manner as “ the unbelieving Jews were broken off, so “ the believing gentiles were grafted in,— “ that is parents and children together. And “ I never saw this really clear (continued he “ with joy in his countenance) until I was “ thinking over, how these broken off Jews “ are again to be brought into their own ol- “ ive tree, which must bring parents and “ children to the same standing as they were “ in before.” Now this is the plain and forcible instruction of St. Paul, and every person bewildered as he was, using the same candour, might find the same relief and comfort.

Again Rom. 15. 27. “ For if the gentiles have been made partakers of their (the Jews)

*spiritual* things their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things." The great blessing granted to the gentiles under the gospel, is that they are made partakers of the *spiritual* things or privileges which the Jews enjoyed before. Spiritual privileges and blessings enjoyed by the Jews under the former and by the gentiles under the latter dispensation are the same. Again, Eph. 3. 6. "That gentiles should be fellow-heirs and of the *same* body (church) and partakers of his promise (covenant) in Christ by the gospel."

---

## SECTION V.

*The scripture character of people in covenant,  
and out of covenant.*

**I**N our enquiry after truth, we find considerable light cast upon this subject, from the use of particular words and phrases, which are uniformly applied to people in Covenant, and are never applied to people not in Covenant. The Jews who were brought into Covenant by circumcision are called an holy people, Deut. 7. 6. 14. 2. 26. 19. 28. 9. Isaiah 62. 12. Daniel 8. 24. 12.

7. and often else where. So the Church is called 1 Pet. 2. 9. So the term holy is applied particularly to the children of the Jews, Ezra 9. 2. Isaiah 6. 13. In other places, the Jews are called God's people, a peculiar people—a peculiar treasure in a variety of instances, both in the Old and New Testament. Christ's ministry to them (being the fulfilment of the mercy Covenanted to Abraham) was the children's bread, Math. 15. 26. They are called the children of the Covenant, Acts 3. 25. Not sinners of the gentiles, Gal. 2. 15. They have a right, by reason God's gracious Covenant to the enjoyment of peculiar privileges. Rom. 3. 1. 2. What advantage then hath the Jew? Or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way; chiefly because that unto them were committed the oracles of God. 9. 3. "Who are Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption and the glory and the Covenants, and the giving of the Law and the service of God and the promises. This character of being God's people, children of the kingdom and of the Covenant, holy, clean, &c. is not given them because they were all sanctified, and had gracious affections in their hearts; but because they were brought into Covenant with an holy God; were dedicated to him, his name was called upon them, the Seal of his gracious Covenant was affixed to them, and they had a regular standing in his Church.

On the other hand the sacred writers have drawn the character, and condition of the uncircumcised gentiles, before they were brought into the same Covenant by the Gospel, directly opposite.

The uncircumcised are called unclean, Isaiah 52. 1. They are called dogs by Christ, who had no right to the children's bread, Math. 15. 26. Without Christ, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, strangers from the covenants of promise, afar off from God, &c. Eph. 2. 12. 13. 17. So in Peter's vision, Acts 10. 14. 28. they are represented as being unclean. And elsewhere unclean, unholy, sinners of the gentiles, heathen, &c.

As soon as they embrace Christ, and receive the seal of the covenant, they have the same character as the Jews. Eph. 2. 13. "But now in Christ Jesus, ye who sometimes were afar off are made nigh, by the blood of Christ." Verse 19. "Now therefore, ye are no more strangers, and foreigners but fellowcitizens of the saints, and of the household of God." 3. 6. "That the gentiles, should be fellow heirs and of the same body, and partakers of his *promise* by the Gospel." This is one instance where the word promise is used for the covenant. When the gentiles embrace the Gospel, they are brought into the same covenant, and church standing as the Jews, and have the same character given them.

Antipedo-baptists say, the character given to the church in the apostolic age cannot agree to children. It is called "A chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people." ( 1 Pet. 2. 9.) But, this is the same character, which, is given to the church, under the former dispensation. God's people in covenant were a peculiar people then as well as now. (Exod. 19. 5.) Deut. 14. 2.—26. 18. Psalm 135. 4.)

If then the church, under the former dispensation, had the same character as under the present, this is further evidence that the church is the same. And if this character would agree to the church formerly, when it was composed of believers and their children; it will agree to the church, when composed of believers, and their children now.

We shall hereafter notice that the same character is ever given to the children of believers who are in covenant, as is given to believers themselves.

---



---

## SECTION VI.

*Evidence of the fact, that children were baptized by the Apostles.*

WE have before proved the children's right to receive baptism, by virtue of the Covenant made with Abraham, the blessings of which come on the gentiles through Jesus Christ. We will now consider what appears to be matter of fact. Instances of baptisms recorded under the ministry of the Apostles are not numerous. The reason doubtless is because the believing Jews did more generally use circumcision, as we shall show in the next section. And we are not to expect evidence in the same manner as if the children had not been in Covenant before; but if they were not baptized we should expect to find clear evidence of that.

In the 2d chapter of Acts we have an account of three thousand who were baptized in one day. Peter says unto them 38th and 39th verses, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. For the promise is unto you and to

your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Here is plain evidence of the baptism of children.

This evidence arises

1. From the words themselves.
2. From their analogy to other Scriptures.
3. From attendant circumstances.
4. From several expressions which follow after.

1. From the words themselves.

Repent, and be baptized every one of you. *Metanoesate, kai baptistheto ekaustos umon.* Literally, repent ye, and let every one of you be baptized. The verb repent is in the second person plural, *repent ye*. The verb baptized, is in the third person singular, agreeing with *ekaustos*, every one. Both verbs are in the imperative mood, and both are commands. Let us then see their extent. Here it is plain that these commands do not run parallel with each other, because they are differently worded. When Peter gave these commands, if he had designed that baptism should be only parallel with the actual repentance of adult persons, he would have continued the same form of expression, and worded each command alike. Then the verb, in each command would have been in the same number and person, and would have had for its agreement, the same nominative case. But now the command



for baptizing is more extensive, than the command for repenting. He does not command every one of them to repent, but he commands every one of them to be baptized. The reason is plain, the little children were not capable of actual repentance, but they were equally capable of all the ends of baptism, as they had been of circumcision.

Peter's commands here are worded in the same manner as those of Moses, Exodus, 12. 22. "And ye shall take a bunch of hyssop, and dip it in the blood that is in the basin, and strike the lintel, and the two side posts with the blood that is in the basin; and none of you shall go out, at the door of his house, until the morning." In the Septuagint, "And every one of you shall not go out," &c.

The command here, to take the bunch of hyssop, &c; is in the Septuagint, as well as in the English, in the same number and person, as Peter's command to repent; and in the command that every one should not go out of the house, is the same word *exastos*, in the same case, number and person, and a verb understood, in the same number to agree with it, as Peter uses.

Here we certainly know that children are comprehended in the latter command, and not in the former. They could not take the bunch of hyssop, &c: but their lives were protected, on condition of their abiding in

the house, where the destroyer might not enter ; and if children are contained here they are in Peter's command for baptism.

Again, when Christ instituted the Supper, he said " Take, Eat, Labete Phagete." Both commands are worded alike. The Supper not being designed, like baptism, for a household ordinance, the Saviour is careful, to word these commands so as to exclude children and infants from *eating*, as well as from *taking* ; and though when he gave the cup and said, " Dring ye all of it," he uses the word *pantes*, with the verb in the same number as the verb to take.

But when Peter gives one command to repent, and another to be baptized, he is as careful to use a form of words, which comprehends children, in the command for baptism, as Christ is to exclude them from the supper ; a form which had been known of old time, to comprehend both *parents* and *children*.

We hence learn, how the apostles understood Christ's commission, when he said, Matth. 28. 19. " Go ye teach all nations bap-tizing them," &c : literally *all the gentiles*. This made baptism equally extensive to the gentiles, as circumcision had been to the Jews.

To evade this evidence, the antipedo-baptist exclaims, " No one can enter into covenant but by his own personal knowledge

“and consent. It must be his own act.  
 “Children are not capable of covenant trans-  
 “actions. To baptize them is to seal a blank!”  
 But God himself has decided this matter.  
 Children were capable of circumcision, which  
 signifies the same as baptism, of entering in-  
 to covenant. Gen. 19. Deut. 29. 12. of re-  
 ceiving blessing from Christ, of being brought  
 to him, of belonging to his kingdom, and of  
 being received in his name. Matt. 18. 5. 19.  
 14.

Peter, in the next place, assigns a reason  
 for his commands. “For the promise is un-  
 to you and to your children.” When a  
 command is given, and a reason assigned, so  
 far as the reason extends so far the command  
 extends too. Both parents and children are  
 plainly comprehended in the command for  
 baptism, and in the reason assigned, both are  
 expressly mentioned. The different word-  
 ing of these two commands, and the express  
 mention of children, lie directly in the way  
 of antipedo-baptists, and these are difficulties  
 which they cannot remove.

2. We will next attend to the analogy of  
 Scripture.

Here Peter evidently quotes, and affirms  
 the sense of the commands, and promises  
 made to Abraham. When God called A-  
 braham he said unto him, Gen. 12. 3. “In  
 thee shall all the families of the earth be  
 blessed.” Again 17. 5. “A father of many

nations have I made thee." And in verse 7, " I will establish my Covenant between me and thee for an everlasting Covenant to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee." These promises made to Abraham, are called by the Apostle " The Covenants of promise." That Peter had reference to each of these promises, one which comprehended the Jews already in Covenant, and the other the gentiles, soon to be brought into the same Covenant, is evident from the current testimony of Scripture. The Covenant with Abraham is emphatically called *the promise*, Rom. 4. 13. Gal. 3. 17, and often elsewhere.

Antipedo-baptists say, The latter clause of the 39th verse, " And to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call," cuts off the children. This interpretation among others, has two insuperable difficulties which prove it cannot be true. The first is the text would contain as much as our brethren are willing to own, if the command for baptism had been worded in the same manner as the command for repentance ; and if that clause " And to your children" had not been added. Why then did Peter command every one to be baptized, when he did not command every one to repent ? Why did he expressly mention the children, when he assigned a reason for baptism, if he designed in

the next words to cut them off? This would not look like an honest Apostle.

The other difficulty is, such an interpretation is inconsistent with the analogy of Scripture. Who then are those afar off? The children of Peter's hearers, or the gentiles, yet out of covenant? The analogy of Scripture will answer the question, and fully prove, he meant the gentiles who had been promised to Abraham, and had not as yet been brought in. The gentiles, Eph. 2. 12. had been "Aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise." Verse 13, "But now in Christ Jesus, ye who sometimes were *afar off* are made nigh, by the blood of Christ." Verse 17, "And came and preached peace to you that were *afar off* and to them that were nigh."—The Jews being in Covenant were nigh to God, Deut. 4. 7. Psalm 148. 14. The gentiles being out of Covenant were *afar off*. Let the Scripture be its own interpreter.

Further; God's call is not, an internal <sup>call</sup> but a call to a church state, which comprehends children as well as parents.

Isaiah 48. 12. "Hearken unto me O Jacob and Israel my *called*." God's call, to a church state, is parallel with the covenant. Children and infants are in the number of God's called. The promise, to as many as God shall call, is to parents and children. The Jews, with their children, were already

called, and the gentiles with theirs would be soon. Peter here quotes the sense and substance of the covenant made with Abraham, and in his next sermon, he expressly mentions it. Acts 3. 25. "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant, which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham "And in thy seed shall all the kindreds, (families, Gen. 12. 3. nations 17. 5.) of the earth be blessed." This great and precious promise, which Peter urges, with so much force, is made to families or households. The covenant promises, and God's call are parallel. Peter's reasoning is clear, and the force of his instruction irresistible.

The Jews well knew what he meant by the *promise* or covenant, which embraced both parents and children. They well knew what he meant by those *afar off*, it was a familiar expression for the gentiles. And they well knew that God had promised Abraham that the gentiles should in time be called to partake of the blessings of that Covenant. The prophets had often told them the same, and so had Jesus Christ. Every word was familiar to his hearers, according to their own modes of expression, former instructions and their Covenant standing.

3. The attendant circumstances support, and confirm the idea that the command was given, and understood, to comprehend chil-

dren. Previous to this, the children of God's people had ever been in Covenant, and had received the Covenant Seal. This is one circumstance.—Their standing then must be good, until an order is given which cuts them off from privileges once granted them. This is a known and established principle, in all matters whether human or divine ; That privileges once granted by a special order cannot be taken away without a special order. In vain have we called upon our brethren to produce any order, either directly or indirectly, by special command or by inference, which takes from children the privileges once granted them, and long enjoyed. It is not to be found in the bible. No, not the least intimation of it. Their standing of course must be good. Is there a law made in the commonwealth, that every male person of the age of 21 years, shall have all the rights of a free citizen? Such right will continue to a thousand ages, though the Legislature, afterwards, be ever silent on that subject. Such right must continue, until a law is made which takes these privileges away. The same argument will hold for the children's right to the seal, and privileges of the Covenant.

Another circumstance was, Peter's hearers who were Jews were very tenacious of their customs, especially of bringing their children into Covenant. They disputed e-

ven for new moon festivals, and how often did they plead, that they were the seed of Abraham, that Abraham was their father, &c. ? It is then very certain that the casting of their children out of Covenant, had such a thing taken place, could not have escaped the notice and censure, at least of the unbelieving Jews and false teachers. As we said before, previous to this time the children had ever received the Covenant seal. They had been included in all great Covenant transactions, Deut. 29. 11. If they were ever cast out, now was the time. At this time our brethren urge they were cast out. Had such a thing taken place, some enquiry, some disputing, some bickering, would have been made about it.

Further, the unbelieving Jews and false teachers, brought every objection against Christ and the Apostles, and their doctrines which either wit could suggest, or malice excite : But they never brought this objection, that the privileges of their children were in the least altered, or abridged. The reason is evident ; such an objection could not be brought.

When we take these circumstances fairly into consideration, it is beyond all credibility that such a revolution took place (as our brethren contend for) at this time and among this people, and not one syllable of objection. Believers themselves would have scrupled



that religion, which so much curtailed them of privileges granted immediately by God himself, and sanctioned by all his teachers, from Abraham down to that very day. And the enemies of Christianity could not have failed in using it to their advantage. They endeavoured to make all believe that Christ was an impostor, and his disciples deluded enthusiasts. What argument would have been so effectual with the people as to tell them this new religion excluded their children from the privileges and seal of the Covenant of God? There must have been a much greater noise about Infant Baptism then than what we hear now.

4. Several expressions, which follow the command, support the idea, that children were included. Verse 41. "Then they that gladly received his word; were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." A definite number of souls is used, to express people in a family state. No correct writer will say, A school, a congregation, or any collection of individuals, not in a family state, contains so many *souls*; but he will say, A village, a congregation, or a country, where a considerable part are in a family state contains so many souls. This mode of expression is in conformity to the scripture. See several instances, in the 46 chap. of Gen. See Exod. 1. 5. 12. 4. The number that went with Ja-

cob into Egypt, Acts 7. 14. is "Threescore and fifteen souls." The number in the Ark is eight souls. These instances we see consisted of families. The number on board the ship, Acts, 27. 37. is "Two hundred, threescore and fifteen souls." This expression is evidence that a considerable part of these, consisted of families; or else the expression would not have been used.

Again, verse 44, "All that believed were together and had all things common." So in the 4th chapter and 32d verse, those who lived in common stock are called, "The multitude of them that believed and were of one heart and of one soul." The whole three thousand souls mentioned in the 41st verse, who were baptized and added, now live in common stock, supplied from one treasury.

They are a distinct company by themselves, and are called believers. This believing multitude was the church. And who were these believers? It is evident here, from the very nature of the case, that this believing multitude, was composed of families, or households. The children we know were here, they must eat and drink as well as their parents, and all who were here are called *believers*.

Believing parents, and their children in covenant, stand in such a relation to God, that the children, have the same *qualifications*, ascribed to them, as belong to their

parents. They are called *believers*. Matt. 18. 6. "But whoso shall offend one of these little ones, which *believe* in me." Christ speaks this, of children distinctly. (Heb. 11. 29.) "By *faith* they passed through the red sea." This comprehends children and parents together. So a number of families supported in common stock, where children are included, and make a part, are without distinction, *all* called believers. "All them that *believed*." "The multitude of them that *believed*."

Even infants in covenant are called God's children, Ezekiel 16. 21.)

Little children belong to the kingdom of God, which phrase usually means the visible church. "Suffer the little children, and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of God."

They are called disciples, Matt. 10. 42. "Whoso shall give to one of these little ones a cup of cold water only, in the name of a *disciple*."

They are also called *holy*. "Else were your children unclean, but now are they *holy*."

So the very *deeds*, and *actions*, which parents do are ascribed unto their children. The uncircumcised man child is, a breaker of the covenant Gen. 17. 14. "He hath broken my covenant." If a child nine or ten days old could break the covenant it

could keep the covenant. But how could it do either? It is the parent's act which is ascribed to the child. God hath joined parents, and children together, that parents may have the greater motives to religion. So at a month old they are stiled keepers of the charge of the sanctuary. Numb. 3. 28. And when the parents are stiled unclean, the children are stiled unclean too.

There was a statute (Deut. 24. 16.) which prohibited a civil magistrate from putting a father to death, for a crime committed by a son, and the contrary. This is referred to 2 Kings, 14. 6. 2 Chron. 25. 4. Jer. 31. 29. 30. Ezekiel, 18. 2. The passage, in Ezekiel, is in consequence of an unjust complaint against God's providence. God never did punish a *good* man for the sins of his father, neither did he ever let a *wicked* man go unpunished, when he committed the same sins as his father had committed. God's method of dealing has ever been the same. Matt. 23. 35. These passages have no reference to the covenant relation of infants.

Every thing dedicated to God is stiled *holy*, as the temple, the offerings, the vessels of the sanctuary, and the *people* in covenant. Not because they are all regenerated; but because they stand in a visible covenant relation to an holy God. This, says the anti-pebo baptist, I know was the case under the

former dispensation. But is it so now? Truly it is. The gentiles enjoy the same spiritual things now and the Jews formerly. Rom. 11. 16. "If the root be holy so are the branches. And if some of the branches are broken off," &c. The root here is the parent, the branches are the children. The branches broken off are the unbelieving Jews. These were stiled *holy* while they continued to stand in the covenant. So the children of believing gentiles, in distinction from unbelievers, and their children are stiled *holy*. 1. Cor. 7. 14. "Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." This is a consequence of the parent's faith.

There was a question, it seems, whether a believing husband might dwell with an unbelieving wife, and the contrary. It had its rise probably, from what is related in the 9th and 10th chapters of Ezra, concerning some who had taken heathen wives, and were not allowed to bring even the children into covenant. Both wives and children must be put away, because the marriage was contrary to an express Law, Deut. 7. 3. The apostle decides this matter, in the same manner, as the law was, for the proselyte, to which undoubtedly he had reference. Exod. 12. 48. "When a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised. That which is common to either sex is usually expressed

in the singular number and masculine gender, as Psalm. i. 1. "Blessed is the man," &c. meaning either a man or a woman. So either a man or a woman might become a profelyte, and have communion with God at the passover. In this case no law had been transgressed in the marriage, and the unbelieving husband or wife was not required to be put away; but was sanctified, i. e. acknowledged in the lawfulness of their relation; and the same law did require the children to be brought into covenant, and united with God's people who are holy. It was the same also with the Jews, verse 49. "One law shall be to him that is home born and to the stranger that sojourneth among you." Whenever a family of Jews through unbelief, neglected to circumcise their children, attend the passover and other duties, either parent brought to repentance, might come without the other, and have communion with God in holy ordinances, but the children, in this case, must immediately be circumcised. In the same manner, the believing gentiles were received. The unbelieving partner was not to be put away; but the *children* must be received into covenant and have the seal administered to them. They were *holy*. Accordingly we read of the baptism of Lydia and her household, Stephanus and his household, the jailor and all his.

Further the word holy, is never in the scripture applied to any person out of covenant, and destitute of the covenant seal. Good men out of covenant are called perfect, righteous, devout fearers of God, &c. as was Job, Noah, Lot, Cornelius and others, but they are never called holy. The term holy is appropriated to persons visibly in covenant, is applied directly to them, but not to any other.

Again the church is called "an holy nation," 1 Pet. 2. 9. But there never was a nation without children. It would be ridiculous to call the church a nation, if the children are not included. And when we find the church called "an *holy* nation," and the children expressly called *holy* too, even this circumstance is very decisive evidence that the children are included, and make a part of the church. It is all in conformity to the idea that the gentiles were grafted in, as the Jews were broken off.

The baptism of the Israelites, at the red sea, was an example for us. 1 Cor. 10. 1. "Moreover brethren I would not that ye should be ignorant, that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Verse 6. "Now these things were our examples, to the intent, that we should not lust after evil things as some of them also lusted." The apostle's

argument is this. As their baptism, at the sea, was an example of ours, so our conduct must be such as theirs ought to have been. "Now (saith Paul,) these things were our examples."—Their baptism was by faith in Jesus Christ, Heb. 11. 23. So is ours. Theirs laid them under obligation to Christ. So does ours. By their disobedience after baptism they tempted Christ, verse 9. By ours we do the same. Theirs comprehended their households, the little children in their parent's arms passed through the sea by faith, and were baptized as well as their parents, not by their own but by their parents' faith.

Thus far the apostle shews the nature, and extent of christian baptism from that example. Three times he uses the word *all*, which makes it exceedingly emphatical.

*All* were under the cloud.

*All* passed through the sea.

*All* were baptized in the cloud, and in the sea.

Two of the households which were baptized, viz. Lydia's and the jailor's, we have an account of, Acts 16. which corresponds with what we have before considered. Paul was directed, by the Holy Ghost to go to Phillippi, an idolatrous heathen city. A few people here had a retired place to meet, and pray to the true God, the rest worshipped idols. This appears to be the first time, that Paul, or any of the apostles ever came



to this city. Luke and Silas, Paul and Timothy were all in company. One convert, viz. "Lydia whose heart the Lord opened," was the fruit of the first sermon. "And when she was baptized, and her household she besought us saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there, and she constrained us." *Us*, implies the writer as one who was Luke. The Lord opened her heart, but no mention is made of the hearts of her household, and she says, "If ye have judged me to be faithful" not me and my household. But when baptism is mentioned it is, "*She and her household.*" Here is not the least intimation, that any one was a believer but Lydia. But when Paul, and Silas came from the prison did they not find brethren here? Truly they did, but they left two brethren Luke and Timothy, who had been constrained to abide here, and who were not a little comforted to hear of the jailor's conversion, and see Paul and Silas set at liberty.

•When the jailor wanted to know, what he should do to be saved, "They said, believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thine house." God in Christ will be a God to thee, and to thy seed, as he promised to Abraham. Salvation shall come to thine house, because thou wilt be a son of Abraham. Luke 19. 9. The meaning is, All thy family shall be brought into

covenant, and enjoy God's appointed means for salvation.

Encouraged with this proposal for himself and family; "He took them the same hour of the night and washed their stripes, and was baptized, he and all his straightway."

From the 34th verse, "And he rejoiced, believing in God with all his house." Our brethren say, The jailor's family were all believers. But the participle, *believing*, is in the singular number, agreeing only with the pronoun *he*, and limits the act of believing to the jailor himself. The word translated, *with all his house* is *panoiki*, an adverb, and properly signifies, householdly, domestically, &c. He was baptized he and all his straightway. The word was preached to all that were in the house, but baptism was administered only to him and *all his*, i. e. to all who were legally under his government.

The result of our inquiry thus far is this, children are comprehended in the commands for baptism, and many circumstances concur to agree with the fact, that they were baptized. Through the New Testament, as well as the Old, the *qualifications* requisite for baptism in adults, are expressly ascribed to believer's children. And what stronger evidence can we need, that children have the same standing in the church, and covenant under the latter as under the former dispensation? If, indeed, to be a *believer*, if to be

holy, if to belong to the kingdom of God, &c. are qualifications, sufficient to entitle *adults* to baptism, the same qualifications, will entitle their children to baptism, and this argument does irresistibly prove the fact, that the apostles did baptize them. The baptism of households, and of the Israelites at the red sea concur in the same idea.

Will any one ask, What propriety there is in calling a child a believer when it cannot exercise personal faith? Let him tell us, What propriety there is in calling an infant, *holy*, or a disciple, or a breaker of the covenant, or a keeper of the charge of the sanctuary? These are things which the divine wisdom hath seen fit to do. "And who art thou O man that repliest against God." His wisdom is unquestionable. He hath made the *parent's* act, the *child's* act. The parent is the head, the representative, and proxy for his children, while they are his.

We will here appeal to the antipedo-baptists themselves, Whether they have or can have any such idea of their unbaptized children, in distinction from unbelievers, and unbeliever's children, as we find in the New-Testament. It is evident they have not, neither can they have; neither could the apostles except such children were baptized. To give the character of baptized persons, to unbaptized children, would be an inconsistency, which no man of reason can admit.

## SECTION VII.

*Children of believing Jews were circumcised under the ministry of the Apostles, and by the direction of the Holy Ghost.*

**T**HOUGH baptism was instituted, circumcision was not abolished, but continued and used as extensively as ever, and by the same authority. We are informed of frequent, and great additions, in the Church at Jerusalem, but we read of no instance of baptism, after the day of Pentecost, and may safely conclude there was none; because they continued the use of circumcision. In the 15th chapter of Acts mention is made, that certain persons (who appear to be of the sect of the Pharisees) came from Judea to Antioch a Gentile city, telling believers there, "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses ye cannot be saved." Paul and Barnabas had no small dissention and disputation with them. Then it was determined that Paul and Barnabas should go up to Jerusalem to question.

If the question had been abolished, and the practice suspended, among the believing Jews, would not Paul and Barnabas have told them so? Certainly they would and here the dispute would have ended.—

When they came to Jerufalem, a council of Apoftles and Elders was called to decide this question; Whether the gentiles muft be circumcised? The Apoftles fpoke feverally in their turns, and gave their reasons.

Peter in his turn faid, verfe 7, “ Men and brethren ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us that the gentiles by my mouth fhould hear the word of the gospel and believe. And God which knoweth the hearts bore them witnefs, giving them the Holy Ghofth as he did unto us and put no difference between them and us.” Peter here refers to Cornelius, and his family.—He reminds the council, that the Holy Ghofth did not require circumcifion of them, but baptifm only, and acknowledged them to ftand on equal ground by baptifm, as the Jews by circumcifion. Paul and Barnabas declare the like witnefs of the Holy Ghofth among the gentiles where they had laboured.

James fpeaks, verfe 13, he could not testify from experience, as others had done, becaufe he had laboured only with the Jews. But he was well acquainted with the prophecies, and draws his conclufions from thence. “ Men and brethren (faid James) hearken unto me.—Simeon (Simon Peter) hath declared how God did at the firft vifit the gentiles to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the

prophets." He then quotes a passage from Amos 9. 12. which foretold the conversion of the gentiles, and also that the Lord's Name should be called upon them. This being done in their baptism, he concludes it sufficient.

Here, observe, the question to be decided was concerning the gentiles distinctly ; and the result of the council was concerning them distinctly. If then circumcision had been abolished, and the Church at Jerusalem had been required to renounce their infant circumcision ; it is impossible for any man to conceive how it could be made a question before that council, Whether the gentiles should be required to be circumcised. The whole business of the council must have been folly, and inconsistency.

Had it not been matter of fact, that circumcision was continued in the Church at Jerusalem, those who went to Antioch would not have had the face to propose and urge it. Paul and Barnabas would have had an irresistible argument against them. They would have said in a word, The Jews themselves have been required to renounce and forbear the practice of that rite. The council would have said the same, it would not have taken a moment's time to decide the question, but now they have a long debate. Indeed it would have been an insult to have brought this question before them, had cir-

cumcision been abolished. The matter is still more clearly expressed in the 21st chapter. There we have an account of Paul's returning again to Jerusalem, where he found James and the Elders.

At this time the enemies of religion had spread a report at Jerusalem, unfavorable to Paul's character as an apostle. The report was, that he had taught the Jews, who lived among the gentiles, that they ought not to circumcise their children. When Paul had conversed with James and the Elders, they were satisfied that the report was false. They intimated to him however, that the Church of Jerusalem would not be easily satisfied. It is said verse 20, "And when they heard it they glorified the Lord and said unto him, Thou see'st brother how many thousands of the Jews there are which believe and they are all zealous of the law: And they are informed of thee that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the gentiles, to forsake Moses saying, they ought not to circumcise their children, and walk after the customs." James tells Paul that the multitude of the brethren was so disturbed that they must needs come together, importing, that they could have no fellowship with him, until they had satisfactory evidence, that the report was false.

James further tells Paul, "Concerning the *gentiles* we have before written and con-

cluded that *they* observe no such thing." James carefully keeps up the distinction between the believing Jews and gentiles. He readily acknowledges, that with regard to the *gentiles*, the matter had been settled by a decree of council. But, there had been no such decree of council, concerning the believing Jews. Circumcision was still in use, and in force with them. Let the reader only attend to these two chapters of the Acts, and he will at once see the truth of the facts which are here maintained. Hence it appears evident, that Christ did not design to change the seal of the Covenant *suddenly*; but *gradually*; so that the believing Jews might have full demonstration, that baptism answered the same ends as circumcision before they were required to leave off using that rite. Several things are here worthy of further notice.

1. The time when these matters were transacted. The decree of the council mentioned in the 15th chapter, was about nineteen, and Paul's return to Jerusalem mentioned in the 21st chapter, about twenty-seven years, after the ascension of Christ.

2. The multitude of believers, in the Christian church at Jerusalem. "Thou seest brother how many thousands of Jews there are which believe." The original word *myriades* signifies ten thousands.—Thou seest brother how many *ten thousands* of Jews there



are which believe. Here were the most copious effusions of the Holy Ghost. This was much the largest Church, we have any account of in the New Testament, as appears from the six first chapters of the Acts.

3. They were all in the practice of infant circumcision. James says, "They are all zealous of the law," not the law of sacrifices, but of circumcision, or the covenant of Abraham. They could have no fellowship with Paul, because they had heard, that he had taught the scattered Jewish converts in his journeys, that they ought not to circumcise their children. James and the Elders advise Paul, by a *public act* of a solemn nature to convince the Church at Jerusalem, that the report was false. His words are these, "And all may know that those things which they are informed of thee are nothing." Paul readily complies with this advice. Hence it is evident that all believing Jews in other countries, who became converts under Paul's ministry circumcised their children.

4. This great church in Jerusalem where infants were universally given up to God in circumcision, was under the stated ministry of the apostle James; and the occasional ministry of the apostles. In this church difficulties and hard questions from churches in other countries were settled. If the church in general, in the apostolic age was the pillar, and ground of truth (1 Tim. 3.

15.) this particular church was eminently so. Hence we are certain, it was no error to retain circumcision under the gospel, as a seal of the covenant.

Further ; it did not seem good to the holy Ghost, to require the gentiles to be circumcised. This fully implies that it *did seem good* unto the Holy Ghost, that circumcision should be continued among the believing Jews, or else there would have been an order to stop the practice of it among them as well as among the gentiles. The Holy Ghost did direct how far circumcision should and how far it should not be extended. It is certain then the continuance of it was no error, but a thing consistent with the divine will. But to neglect the children, and put no seal upon them, would have been considered a material error. "Thou teachest them to forsake Moses," apostasian, literally apostacy from Moses. To deny the children's right was considered *apostacy* by the Apostles, and Church at Jerusalem.

5. The proof is then certain from the evidence of fact, that infants under the Gospel are as much the subjects of the seal, as they were under the former dispensation.-- The practice of twenty-seven years, by the united voice of all the Apostles, is enough to satisfy the mind of any candid enquirer.

Further—the same distinction continued, through the apostolic age. The believing

Jews used circumcision as the initiating seal, and the gentiles used baptism. The Church at Jerusalem is repeatedly called The circumcision, and the baptized gentiles, The uncircumcision. Eph. 2. 11. Rom. 3. 30. "Seeing it is one God which shall justify the circumcision by faith and the uncircumcision through faith." By faith, and through faith are the same thing. God did in the same manner justify both. Again Paul says, Gal. 2. 7. 8. "The Gospel of uncircumcision was committed unto me as the Gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter. For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the Apostleship of the circumcision the same was mighty in me toward the gentiles." God did own and bless the one as well as the other.

6. Though the believing Jews used circumcision, and the believing gentiles used baptism, there was no difference, the Church was *one*, and the children of each are declared holy. "The whole Church was as an holy nation." If it was apostacy for the believing Jews not to circumcise their children it must have been equal apostacy for the believing gentiles not to baptize theirs. The believing Jews and believing gentiles all communed together at the Lord's table as much as if they had used the same seals. Not only the Apostles, but all Churches have communion with the Church at Jerusalem.

We see then how near our brethren come,

to the practice of the Apostolic Church. The apostles taught believers, to dedicate their children to God, and put the seal of his gracious Covenant upon them. Believers' infants, they styled believers also, called them holy, and the Church "an holy nation." This our brethren refuse to do.

The whole church at Jerusalem under the ministry of the Apostles, could not have fellowship with Paul, when it was reported, that he had denied circumcision to some children. Our brethren will not have fellowship with us, because we cannot with a good conscience, deny baptism to our children. What would they have said, if they had been invited to commune with the Church at Jerusalem?

Circumcision and baptism did both signify the same things, as we shall show hereafter. If it was a duty and a privilege, for the Church at Jerusalem to give up their children in covenant, and put the seal of the righteousness of their faith upon them, it is equally so with us to give up our children in baptism. The denial of fellowship, is then the reverse now, from what it was under the ministry of the Apostles.

Even on their own principles, our brethren cannot justify their conduct in making such a breach in the Church, by denying fellowship. If either party may be justified in denying fellowship, we have the example of

the church at Jerufalem on our fide ; yet we would not wifh to be fo uncharitable and cenforious as to make a fchifm in the church of Chrifh “ which is the body of him that filleth all in all.” Some perhaps will fay Many Jews were baptized, efppecially on the day of Pentecoft, and why was this ? Was there not the fame neceffity for baptizing all of them, as fome of them ?

There are reasons which to candid minds will doubtlefs appear fatisfactory. Thofe Jews who received baptifm, were generally and probably all of them, fuch as had openly perfecuted Chrifh and the church, or elfe had fallen away to the practice of open and fcandalous fins. It had been a practice of long ftanding, to baptize fuch perfons when they profefled repentance. Such characters John baptized, and fuch the difciples baptized, while Chrifh was with them. Such was the character of Paul, and for this reason he muft be baptized, and we muft be informed of fuch baptifm. Peter, on the day of Pentecoft, charges his hearers with the murder of Chrifh ; from whence it appears evident, they had generally been forward in crying, Crucify him, Crucify him. Thefe and their households muft be baptized in the name of that Jefus whom they had put to death. But it does not appear that baptifm was continued long in the church at Jerufalem. It was alfo proper that baptifm fhould be acknowl-

edged in the church at Jerufalem, as an inftitution of Chrift. This would lay a foundation for union and harmony with believing gentiles who were to ufe only baptifm, and the moft proper time for this, was the day of Pentecoft, when the Holy Ghof in a vifible and powerful manner, bore testimony to it.

---

## SECTION VIII.

*Circumcifion, no part of the Ceremonial Law.*

WE have before feen, the inconfiftency of fupposing, the covenant of circumcifion, to be annexed to the law of ceremonies, no two things being more diftinct.

The prophets were very exprefs, in declaring the perpetuity of the covenant, and in foretelling the end of the ceremonial law. So the apoftle is always plain on the fubject of the ceremonial law ; telling us it is abolifhed. Eph. 2. 15. blotted out, taken out of the way, and nailed to the crofs of Chrift. Col. 2. 14. The fubftance of the whole epiftle to the Hebrews, is defigned to fhew, the end, the accomplifhment, and removal of the ceremonial law. In the courfe of this and the other epiftles, the apoftle is fo particular

as to mention distinctly, the passover, the offering of beasts, the sprinkling of blood, and indeed every thing of a typical nature; but *remember* he never intimates that *circumcision* had been abolished. Had it been part of the law of types and ceremonies, it *must* have been abolished, with the law. The use of it under the ministry of the apostles, is a certain evidence, that it was not abolished, and that it was *not* a part of that law. Why then does James mention the law of Moses in connexion with circumcision? Acts 21. 20. 24. "They are all zealous of the law." "Thou thyself also walkest orderly and keep-est the law."

Whatever law this was, which was connected with circumcision, it is evident that Paul, and the church at Jerufalem did keep it; but we cannot believe, that Paul and the church at Jerufalem, kept the ceremonial law. This is every where denied. The law of Moses often means the covenant of Abraham, as we have before seen, John 7. 22, and this must be the meaning of James in the words just noticed. When the apostles speak of a law which is necessary, or proper to be observed they never mean the ceremonial law, but either the covenant of Abraham or else the moral law. When they speak of a law, *not* proper to be observed, or tell us it is abolished, then they always mean the law of types, and ceremonies.

Circumcision itself has been supposed by some, to be a type of Christ, because blood was shed; but, we have no intimation in the bible that it was, nor that it signified more to the Jews, than baptism does to the gentiles. The bible informs us that it was,

“A token of the covenant.”

“The sign of regeneration.”

“A seal of the righteousness of faith.”

But it never intimates, that it was a type of Christ. If it had been a type of Christ, then Christ in receiving it, must have been a type of himself, and the shedding of his blood, a type of the shedding of his blood. And what is most satisfactory is, if it had been ceremonial or typical of Christ, it could not have been continued after his death.

Neither was circumcision continued, as a matter of indifference, to keep up a friendship with the unbelieving Jews. Paul was not required to satisfy the unbelieving Jews, but the church. Or, if it had been a matter of indifference, Paul might have circumcised Titus, as well as Timothy. The church, at Jerusalem, did not consider it a matter of indifference, neither did the apostles, as we shall show in the next section.



---



---

## SECTION IX.

*Circumcision and Baptism signify the same things,  
and answer the same ends.*

THE light in which the apostles viewed circumcision, we learn from many passages of scripture. A few of these we will notice. Acts 7. 8. "And he gave him, (Abraham) the covenant of circumcision." It was a covenant gift, and covenant seal. Rom. 4. 11. "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, being yet uncircumcised." 15. 8. "Now I say, that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision, for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers."

What more can be said of baptism, than to say, It is a token of God's covenant, a seal of the righteousness of faith, and Christ is the minister of it? The meaning and intent of circumcision was *spiritual*; so is the meaning of baptism. It was the ordinance of admission into the church; so is baptism. It was a token of visible relation, and covenant obligation to God; so is baptism. The

circumcised were visibly the Lord's people ; so are the baptized. Circumcision was a visible sign of grace in the heart. The apostle calls it " The sign of circumcision," that is of the circumcision of the heart. Again he says, " Circumcision is that of the heart in the spirit and not in the letter." Baptism is a sign of the same grace in the heart, therefore we read of the baptism of the *spirit*, of the *Holy Ghost*, &c. Heart circumcision and heart baptism is the same thing ; consequently external circumcision and external baptism must signify the same thing too.

Each ordinance was also administered in a manner very similar.

A name was given the circumcised child. Luke 1. 59. " When they came together to circumcise the child they called his name Zacharias." It was a matter of importance that the name should be called right, as it could not be altered afterwards. This is evident from the words following. Again Luke 2. 21. When eight days were accomplished, for the circumcising of the child his name was called JESUS. The calling of a person's name in this ordinance was of divine appointment. God gave a name to Abraham, and to his wife when he instituted this rite, and received them into Covenant. The name which a person receives in the solemn ordinance of circumcision or baptism is sacred. God hath designed that our own

names should remind us of his name, and Covenant faithfulness in Christ. Though no passage in the Old Testament expressly mentions the calling of the name in circumcision, yet there are many which imply it; and though none in the New expressly mention the calling of a person's name in baptism there are also many which imply it.

A company of Christians is called so many names, Acts 1. 15. Rev. 3. 4—So the names of christians are said to be in the book of Life, Philip. 4. 3. Rev. 3. 5—13. 8. and elsewhere. Antipedo-baptists have of late omitted part of the ordinance, when they baptize adults; that is, calling the name of the person whom they baptize; evidently with a view to avoid, as much as possible, every thing which made a part of the ordinance of circumcision. It is evident enough however that the name was not omitted in the Apostolic age. The people of God had names, the gentiles as well as Jews.

Farther; several passages of Scripture plainly allude to the practice of calling God's Name, over the circumcised child. 2 Chron. 7. 14. "If my people which are called by my name," &c. Literally upon whom my name hath been called. Jeremiah 14. 9. "We are called by thy name," literally, thy name hath been called upon us. Expressions of this kind are frequently to be met with. So it was foretold in prophecy, that the hea-

then, or gentiles should be called by God's name. Amos 9. 12. "And all the heathen which are called by my name saith the Lord." Literally, again upon whom my name is called. St. James quotes this passage, Acts 15, 17. "And all the gentiles upon whom my name is called saith the Lord." This is rendering the Hebrew literally, and the septuagint is also the same. As the Jews were called by God's name, literally had God's name called upon them, so the prophet foretells that God's name should be called upon the gentiles. This was done, when the gentiles received baptism, the ordinance of admission into the Church and Covenant of God.

So it was foretold that the church should be called by a new name. Isaiah 62, 2. "Thou shalt be called by a new name which the mouth of the Lord shall name." The Hebrew again is thus, A new name shall be called upon thee, the mouth of the Lord shall name it. This is the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, given by the mouth of the Lord Christ, Math. 28. 19.

The seal of God's covenant, which was the ordinance of admission into his church, must be sanctioned by the solemn invocation of his holy name. And those who omit calling the name of the person for fear of imitating circumcision, might for the same reason omit calling the name of the Trinity.

To this our brethren object,

1st. If baptism succeed circumcision, Why are females baptized?

Answer. Females were no more neglected under the former dispensation than the males. The covenant promise, "I will be a God to thee and to thy seed," comprehends females, as well as males. Sarah was brought into covenant, and had a name as well as Abraham. So when God says, "If my people which are called by my name" (upon whom my name is called) he comprehends both sexes. The females then were contained in the promise, had a name given them and the name of God called upon them.

In administering the ordinance to the different sexes, there was a circumstantial distinction (and it was circumstantial only) the males had a mark in the flesh, but the females had not. It is highly probable, that the mode of receiving females was by baptism. Credible writers of antiquity tell us "Gentile profelytes and their children were first baptized, and then the males were circumcised." The mode in which female profelytes were received was by baptism. And whence came this practice, of admitting female profelytes, by baptism, if this had not been *originally* the mode in which females were admitted? This seems to be implied, Acts 8. 12. "And they were baptized both *men and women,*" that is *male and female.*

Under the former dispensation, women or females were admitted into the church by baptism, but now both *men* and women.

This we know, that the females were in the covenant, and members of the church as well as the males. They had the same privileges of communion with God, in holy ordinances. Christ declares the woman whom he healed, Luke 13. 16. "A daughter of Abraham," which phrase imports a member of the church. This also we know, that the difference of administering the ordinance to the different sexes was only circumstantial. The material and essential parts of the ordinance were administered to both sexes alike. But now there is no distinction.

2d. If baptism takes the place of circumcision, say the antipedo-baptists, it is not valid except it be administered on the eighth day.—Ans. Circumcision was valid when administered on any day. Why not baptism? Exod. 4. 25. 12. 48. Joshua 5. 2.

Further, history informs us, that about 150 years after Christ, this question was moved by one Fidus a presbyter, Whether baptism ought not to be performed on the eighth day? A council of sixty-six bishops or ministers, was convened from all parts, to decide it, and were unanimous in their opinion, that the day was not material.

3. They say again, Baptism cannot succeed circumcision, because circumcision

made a visible mark in the flesh by which a person's standing might be known, but baptism does not. Ans. Females were received then, without a mark in the flesh. And for males, this mark was no evidence of their standing or membership in the church, except it appeared so from the records. Ezra 2. 62. Neh. 7. 5. 64. The reason was this, the posterity of Ishmael and of Esau, the Samaritans and some other nations had the same mark, as well as the Jews. The thing was so common, that it was no more a mark of distinction, than no mark at all, and when duly administered there was the same necessity for a record of it, as there is for a record of baptism.

These objections then, amount to nothing. Circumcision and baptism do signify the same things, answer the same ends, and were administered with the same solemnity. This is satisfactory evidence that baptism does succeed circumcision, and is appointed to take the same place in the church.

Circumcision being continued, under the ministry of the apostles, and by the guidance of the holy Ghost, it *must* be used with the same spiritual meaning it had before. That is, as a token of God's covenant, and seal of the righteousness of faith. It had been of such long standing in the church, considered so sacred in its nature, and so interesting in its consequences; always known

to the Jews as the ordinance which initiated them into the church, and covenant of God; instituted immediately by God himself; patronized and sanctioned by all his prophets and teachers; without which they had never been allowed to claim any promise; nor be entitled to any religious privilege; believers themselves would have doubted the truth of that religion which took it suddenly from them, and the divine wisdom did not see fit to do it.

---

## SECTION X.

*Evidence from the Epistles, that circumcision was disallowed, when false teachers urge it upon the baptized gentiles, but approved of among the believing Jews.*

WE have already seen what was done at Antioch. We will now pursue the path of Apostolic practice as it is clearly discovered from the Epistles. False teachers, took advantage from the continuance of circumcision among the believing Jews, to urge it upon the gentiles. It appears also, that they had a design of bringing the gentiles to



observe the ceremonial law ; and the gain of the offerings was doubtless their object. Had they succeeded in the matter of circumcision they might then have done that, among the ignorant gentiles, which they could not do among the more enlightened Jews. The Apostles ever speak in favour of circumcision, except, when these false teachers urge it upon the gentiles.—Then they speak pointedly against it. The Church at Galatia was much troubled with these false teachers, which was the occasion of the Epistle to that church. The apostle's main design, in this Epistle, is to prove to the Galatians, that the covenant made with Abraham, and the ceremonial law are two distinct things : that the ceremonial law had come to an end, but the covenant of Abraham still remained, and the believing gentiles were brought visibly into that covenant by baptism, and needed not to be *circumcised*. Under these circumstances he tells them Gal. 2. 3. that he himself had refused to circumcise Titus who was a gentile, and assigns the reason. “ Because of false brethren unawares brought in who came to spy out our liberty, and bring us into bondage, to whom we gave place by subjection, no not for an hour.” Though the Apostles continued circumcision among the believing Jews they never allowed the gentiles to use that rite, but baptism.

Now the gentile believers at Galatia had been baptized, and the false teachers urged them to be circumcised; insinuating that they could not be brought completely into the covenant of Abraham, any other way. Paul says 5, 2. "If ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing: For I testify again to every man that is circumcised that he is a debtor to do the whole law." It is evident from this last clause, that they were urged to be circumcised with a view to the law of ceremonies, and consenting to it with this view would make them debtors. In the 11th verse he says, "If I yet preach circumcision why do I yet suffer persecution?" That he did preach it is evident; but not in the sense of these false teachers, for then would the offence of the cross have ceased, as he says. He preached it simply as a seal of the covenant, but not as the *only seal*: For Christ in whom that covenant was confirmed had appointed another seal especially for the gentiles.

There was another difficulty which these gentile converts laboured under. A part of this church consisted of Jews who continued the practice of circumcision, and were allowed in it by the apostles. These were willing enough to encourage the gentiles to be circumcised, only lest they should suffer persecution, 6. 12. But even these he tells them did not keep the law, verse 13. that is the

law of ceremonies. Here then are three plain reasons why these gentile converts might not be circumcised. One is they had been baptized, and were already brought into the covenant of Abraham. Another is it was contrary to the decree of the council, Acts 15, that the gentiles should be circumcised. At Antioch, Paul only disputed the propriety of circumcision among the gentiles, but since the matter had been settled by a council he speaks with *authority*. A third reason is they would have been in danger of being brought into bondage of the ceremonial law, by the seducing arts of these false teachers, who *perverted* the very meaning and design of circumcision. But this was not the case when Paul circumcised Timothy, Acts 16. 3. This was not the case with the whole church at Jerusalem, and with believing Jews in other countries, who used this rite so extensively. Those who received circumcision had not first received baptism. Neither was there any decree of council against the use of this rite among them. Neither were they in danger of being brought into bondage. They did not do it, in the sense in which Paul condemns it, but in the sense in which he and the other apostles approved of it. It is true there is a sense in which it was denied, and pointedly spoken against, and Paul himself gives reasons why he did it. It is equally true

there is a sense in which it was highly approved, not only by the apostles and elders in council but even by Paul also. We have already had sufficient evidence of this in the foregoing sections: But we will consider a little more.

Rom. 2. 25. "For circumcision verily profiteth if thou keep the law." This sentence is highly emphatical, pronounced with a *verily*. Paul does not say, circumcision did once profit, but he speaks in the present time, now. It verily profiteth. It is certain that Paul does not mean, if thou keep the *ceremonial* law; that law was abolished. Neither does he mean to propose an impossible case and say, If thou keep the moral law, yes if thou *canst* keep it, perfectly and without sin, then circumcision verily profiteth. This I say is not his meaning, for if a person could do this he would have no *need* of circumcision. It could not profit him, if he was perfect without it. Neither does he mean to encourage a legal, or self righteousness in any sense. This he ever spoke against. But his meaning is, Circumcision verily profiteth, if thou live according to the ends of its institution; if thou use the means, and improve the privileges connected with it, and rest not in any thing short of sanctification, which is the thing signified by it. But if thou fail to improve these privileges, and means; and if thou rest in any thing short

of sanctification, "Thy circumcision is made uncircumcision." "For he is not a Jew which is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the Spirit, and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men but of God." Baptism is the same. He is not a Christian, which is one outwardly, neither is that baptism, which is outward in (or on) the flesh, but he is a Christian which is one inwardly, and baptism is that of the heart in the Spirit and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men but of God.

In the next chapter Rom. 3. 1. he says, "What advantage then hath the Jew? Or what profit *is* there (not *was* there) of circumcision?" If you may rest in nothing short of sanctification of the heart, you will say, What advantage then hath the Jew? Or what profit is there of this outward circumcision? He affirms again "Much every way, chiefly because that unto them were committed the oracles of God." That is, the privileges and promises of the covenant.

If then, it might be said that circumcision was, at this time, profitable any way, it is again certain that it was not abolished, much more when Paul declares, It verily profiteth, there is much profit in it every way, and especially, as it is the ordinance of admission into the church, and covenant of God. The

privileges of such a standing, are summed up in these words 9. 3. "Who are Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises." These privileges were the things committed, and rightly improved were of infinite advantage to the Jew first and also to the gentile.

---

## SECTION XI.

*Further evidences of the equality of circumcision and baptism, or Jews and gentiles united in the same Churches with these different seals.*

THE great question or matter of dispute in the church, in the apostolic age, was, not whether infants should be baptized, but whether baptism was as good as circumcision. This was a natural enquiry, and what we should expect to find. It was frequently made a question, and ever determined in the affirmative; which puts the matter beyond all dispute that baptism takes the place of circumcision and the same persons as were the subjects of the former must be also of the latter.

As we have noticed before, credible writers tell us, that baptism was of ancient use among the Jews. Those Jews who apostatized, were baptized when they returned, and gentile profelytes and their children were first baptized, and then the males were circumcised. But as a seal of the covenant, separate from circumcision, baptism was new; and as circumcision was certainly known, to be God's own institution, believing Jews were unwilling to omit it, for baptism only.

We observed in the seventh section, that the question before the council, Acts 15, was concerning the gentiles only, in distinction from Jews. The merits of that question will now be considered. What was the question? Only this, Must the baptized gentiles be circumcised? What was implied in this question? Simply this. Whether their baptism was alone sufficient? Was it as good as circumcision? If not, though they had received baptism they must be circumcised. Christ had commanded the gentiles to be baptized, but he had not said they should not be circumcised. His command for baptism was very similar to the mode, in which gentile profelytes, and their children had been received. It was needful therefore, that this matter, about the validity of baptism, should be settled by authority as we find it was. Peter in the council declares the testimony of the Holy Ghost in favour of the validity,

and sufficiency of baptism, without circumcision, in the family of Cornelius. Paul and Barnabas in the same council, declare the same evidence of the Holy Ghost where they had laboured, and had used only baptism. James in the same council mentions from prophecy the necessity of calling God's name upon them. From his choosing this passage, out of, perhaps, a thousand others which foretold the calling of the gentiles, it is evident he considered the invocation of God's name over the subject, one of the most essential parts of the covenant seal. This had been done in baptism, as well as in circumcision. From these evidences of the Holy Ghost and from immediate influences of the same spirit, the council conclude, that circumcision was not necessary for the gentiles. In other words that their baptism was equally good and valid as circumcision, that the gentiles stood on the same ground with the Jews, and had the same privileges, and advantages in the covenant and in the church.

It is well known also that several of the churches to which the apostle wrote letters consisted partly of Jews and partly of gentiles, especially at Rome, Galatia, and Corinth. Many Jews, who had settled themselves in these places, became early converts to the Christian faith, under the ministry of the apostles, as well as great numbers of gentiles. This idea is evident from the Epistles,



and helps us to understand many passages in them, which would otherwise be unintelligible. In the second, third, and fourth chapters to the Romans, the apostle is very express in describing the nature of circumcision, and the benefit the Jews received from it; because it brought them visibly into covenant and gave them the best means for their spiritual interest. He encourages them in strong terms to continue the practice of it. In the same chapters, he is equally explicit with regard to the gentiles, showing that they, by faith, stood on equal ground, and enjoyed equal advantages with the Jews.

We will now attend to some particular passages. Rom. 3. 29. "Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not of the gentiles also? Yes of the gentiles also. Seeing it is one God which shall justify the circumcision by faith and the uncircumcision through faith." 4. 9. "Cometh this blessedness upon the circumcision only, or upon the uncircumcision also?" 10. 12. "For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek; for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him." The Jews who circumcised, and the gentiles who baptized, both stand alike and share equally in divine favours.

That a part of this church never was baptized is evident from the 31 verse of the 6th chapter, "Know ye not that so many of us

as were baptized into Christ were baptized into his Death ?”

This means only a part. Some were not baptized. He says so many of *us*, including himself as the writer, with the church to which he wrote. He was not addressing himself to a mixed assembly of professors and non professors, but to a church of professed Christians, part Jews and part gentiles. To the Galatians he writes the same. In this church also the dispute ran high, Whether baptism was sufficient. The false teachers said it was not, they *must* be circumcised. In reply to these Paul says (3. 27.) “For as many of *you* as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.” They have a regular standing in his church. He says, As many of *you*—of you members of the church of Galatia, as have been baptized. This implies that there were some in these churches who had not been baptized. Compare these with like expressions elsewhere. John 1. 11. “He (Christ) came unto his own (the Jews) and his own received him not. But to as many (of them, the Jews) as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God.” Now these expressions concerning the church at Rome and at Galatia, do as clearly imply, that some of the members in these churches were not baptized, as the other expression, that some of the Jews did not receive Christ.

Paul does not say, As many of the world, but he says, So many of *us* as were baptized, and, As many of *you* as have been baptized. These expressions are confined to these churches.

The fact is evident, these churches consisted in part of Jews who were circumcised, and in part of gentiles who were baptized, and their standing is equal.

To avoid this evidence, perhaps it may be said, The apostle meant spiritual baptism. A little attention will shew that he did not. In the 6th chapter to the Romans, he is urging the necessity of a holy life, from the spiritual meaning of baptism; as he had done in the 3d from the same spiritual meaning of circumcision. In Gal. 3. 27. it is evident from the whole argument of the apostle, that he is speaking particularly of the visible standing of the gentile or baptized part of that church. Their visible standing was called in question. In the preceding verse he says, "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ." "For as many of you as have been baptized into Jesus Christ have put on Christ." He does not say, Ye have all been baptized into Jesus Christ; but he says, "Ye are *all* the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ." And how does this appear? "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." "There is neither Jew nor Greek.

Ye are all one in Christ Jesus." That is, are in one covenant. "For if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise."

This settles the whole matter with them, that baptism without circumcision was sufficient.

The Church at Corinth also consisted both of Jews and gentiles, and so did several others. With regard to these the Apostle is equally explicit. 1 Cor. 7. 17. 18. "As the Lord hath called every man so let him walk: and so ordain I in all churches. Is any man called being circumcised? Let him not become uncircumcised: is any called in uncircumcision? Let him not become circumcised."

Here was the same dispute, Whether baptism, alone was sufficient? And it could not be settled in words plainer than these. Whatever reason there was, at the first preaching of the Gospel, to baptize some who had been circumcised, it did not last long. At this time the believing Jew, who had received circumcision, might not be suffered to renounce it, and consider it a nullity, for the sake of baptism, and the believing gentile might not be circumcised.

This was a standing order not only for this, but for all churches. "So ordain I in all churches." This decree of the apostle agrees with the decree of the council, Acts 15.

Here then is certain evidence, that circumcision was still used as a seal of the covenant, and for no other end. Had not this been the case the believing Jew must have been required to renounce it and receive baptism. Paul goes on further to say, verse 19. Circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commands of God. Parallel to this is Gal. 5, 6. 6, 15. Col. 3, 11.

The fact is, the apostle evidently introduces these passages to put a check to the dispute about circumcision and baptism which had already gone too far. The false teachers said that baptism was good for *nothing*, and the gentiles must be circumcised. The believing Jews also who used the former seal preferred it to baptism, and thought it best. In some degree of reproach they called baptism and the baptized gentiles, The uncircumcision, Eph. 2, 11. And it is but natural to suppose that the baptized gentiles said, Baptism is best. It was the easiest and they "rejoiced for the consolation" when they were freed by the council from the former seal, Acts 15. 31.

Now Paul neither condemns the one nor the other, nor justifies the one more than the other; but he calls their attention to the spirituality of both. His meaning is only this, you have no need to differ about circumcision and baptism. Both are seals alike

good, and signify the same things. Only live according to the great end of their appointment ; have faith in Christ ; love and obedience to God ; be holy in heart and life ; this is what is signified by those seals. In comparison of this they are nothing ; without this they will become a nullity, and with this you have nothing to fear.

Again, 1 Cor. 12. 5. " There are differences of administrations but the same Lord." The plainest difference was, in the administration of these different seals. And because baptism was administered to some and circumcision to others, that was no cause why there should be a breach of fellowship. Indeed it does not appear that the dispute ever arose so high as to break or interrupt their communion. Jews and gentiles had the same Lord and the same standing in the church. This was the foundation of their fellowship. In the same chapter, verse 13, he says again, " By one Spirit we are all baptized into one body whether we be Jews or gentiles."

Now he says *All*, he does not say *As many as*. Spiritual baptism was the same both to Jews and gentiles, but water baptism was not.

That water baptism was not a general thing, is further evident from the 15th chap. 29th verse. " Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead if the dead rise not at all ? Why then are they baptized for the dead ?" Here is something spoken of some Christians which is not spoken of all.

The words *they* and *baptized*, are emphatical and distinguish a part from the whole. The latter part of the sentence also is elliptical. The word *resurrection* is understood. This was the subject of discourse. What shall *they* do which are baptized for the resurrection of the dead, if the dead rise not at all; why are *they* then baptized for the dead? That is, for the resurrection of the dead?

Now to receive this baptism and submit to the cross which in some respects was heavier on the baptized than on the circumcised, was in vain if the dead rise not. "Why stand we in jeopardy every hour." All who were baptized, were baptized for the dead, that is for the resurrection of the dead, but only a part had been baptized.

The fact is, circumcision was continued as a seal of the covenant, but was confined among the Jews. Baptism was not general, and used mostly among the gentiles. These ideas of the perfect equality of circumcision for Jews, and baptism for gentiles, the Apostles improved and cultivated by enjoining unity and fellowship between them, frequently uniting Jews and gentiles together in the same churches with these different seals, and at all occasional opportunities, inviting them to communicate together in other churches, at the Lord's table.

Had we no other evidence, to support the

fact, that infants of believing gentiles were baptized, here is enough in this section. The infants of believing Jews were brought into covenant by circumcision. This privilege was retained and enjoyed under the ministry of the apostles. As we have noticed, in the beginning of this section, the apostle is express in declaring, That the Jews were no better than the gentiles ; that God was not the God of the Jews only, but of the gentiles also ; that the same blessedness came on the gentiles as on the Jews ; that there was no difference between them ; that baptism was as good as circumcision ; brought the gentiles visibly into the church and covenant of Abraham.

If then the children of gentiles had not the benefit of the covenant seal, there must have been a wide difference and these scriptures cannot be true. This is not only plain but positive evidence of the fact, that the apostles admitted the children of gentiles to baptism, in the same manner as the children of Jews were admitted to circumcision.



## SECTION XII.

*Christ's commission to the apostles, to teach and baptize, had a special reference to gentiles in distinction from Jews.*

**J**ESUS said unto his disciples, Mat. 28. 19. "Go ye therefore teach all nations baptizing them," &c. Literally, disciple all the gentiles baptizing them. The Jews had been discipled, from the days of Abraham. From that time Christ had a church among them, and they are called his own, John 1. 11. Christ owned and had fellowship with them as his church, though he knew that many individuals were as corrupt as Judas. He approved their worship in the Temple, and in the synagogue. As his custom was he went into the synagogue on the sabbath day.

The word ethne, which in Christ's commission is translated nation, is used in the septuagint and in the New Testament some hundreds of times. It was the common word to distinguish the gentiles from the Jews. Panta (all) is often joined with it, where we have the phrase, all nations, ●

the gentiles, or all the heathen. The word ethne is indifferently translated gentiles, nations and heathen. It might in every instance have been translated gentiles. This would have been strictly proper and literal. The indifferent and synonymous use of the three words nations, gentiles and heathen, in the translation, has left the sense more undetermined. Let us compare three passages which relate to the matter in question. Amos, 9. 12. God speaks of calling the gentiles and says, "And all the heathen which are called by my name saith the Lord," panta ta ethne, in the septuagint. Math. 28. 19. Christ says, "Go ye therefore teach all nations baptizing them," panta ta ethne, in the original. Acts 15. 17. St. James speaking of the conversion of the gentiles, repeats the prophesy from Amos, "That the residue of men might seek after the Lord and all the gentiles upon whom my name is called saith the Lord," panta ta ethne, again. In Amos they are called, All the heathen; in Christ's commission, All nations, and in Acts All the gentiles. The Greek in each of these passages is the same; it is the translation only that differs.

When the Jews are comprehended, another word is used, even where panta ta ethne is used. As in Rom. 15, 10. Rejoice ye gentiles ethne with his people laou (the Jews.) The next verse is similar to it. That

Christ had reference to the gentiles, in distinction from Jews is further evident from this consideration. The disciples had authority to teach and labour among the Jews previous to this; but not among the gentiles. They had been expressly charged, Math. 10. 5. "Go not in the way of the gentiles (ethne.\*)" Christ himself laboured among the Jews, and often commanded his disciples to do the same. Here they knew their duty. After his resurrection Christ made their duty known, concerning the gentiles; go disciple all the gentiles baptizing them. He also gave a particular charge to Peter concerning the Jews, saying, "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep." Christ had repeatedly called the Jews "his own, his sheep, the lost sheep of the house of Israel," &c. Peter it is evident understood this of the Jews. He fulfilled this charge by taking upon himself the apostleship of the circumcision. His labours were chiefly among them. They all understood that they were not immediately to go to the gentiles, although they had received a commission for that purpose.

When the time was fully come, that the door of covenanted mercies should be opened to the gentiles; Christ signified it to Peter by a vision from heaven, Acts 10. This vision did not contain a new commission, neither was it designed to rectify any mis-

takes of the apostles, but it contained necessary information, that the time was come, when they must enter on the duties of their commission to the gentiles. This commission, then to baptize the gentiles, did not require the apostles to discontinue circumcision among the Jews.

---

### SECTION XIII.

*The benefit of children was one important end, for which a visible Church of God was instituted in the world.*

**G**OD had the children in view, when he made man, Malachi 2, 15. "Did he not make one? Yet had he the residue of the spirit. And wherefore one? That he might seek a Godly seed." God foresaw the fall of man before he created him. He foresaw every thing that he should do for man's redemption. When he began to people the world he made one. One pair; one woman for one man. And wherefore one? He had the residue of the spirit. He might have created millions as well as one. He chose from one pair to people the world, by a suc-

cession of generations in a family state. And why? That he might seek a Godly seed. A seed in covenant relation with himself, and under covenant obligations to obey his commandments. A seed educated in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. The prophet in the connexion reproves the wickedness of some parents, because it interrupted the gracious benefits, which God designed for their children. God instituted one family at the beginning that he might seek a godly seed. His purpose is ever the same. God was pleased to bring this plan into full execution, when a visible church was instituted, in the family of Abraham. In this covenant, provision is made for the children of believers. God said "I will be their God," and he gave commandment, <sup>that</sup> they should receive the token of his covenant. Here they were to be educated and trained up for God.

The Psalmist tells us, that God commanded a particular law for the instruction of children, and further explains God's view with regard to the children. Psalm 78. 5, 6, 7, "For he established a testimony in Jacob, and a law in Israel which he commanded our fathers, that they should make them known to their children. That the generation to come might know them, even the children which should be born, who should arise and declare them to their children :

That they might set thair hope in God and not forget the works of God." This law the Psalmist tells us, God commanded the fathers, that is the Patriarchs, such as Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Reference is made to this law when God says, "I know my servant Abraham that he will command his children and his household after him and they shall keep the way of the Lord." Moses reminds the people of this duty, Deut. 6. 7. 20. Let us bring this evidence into one view. God tells us by the prophet, that he did it to seek a Godly seed. When he institutes a visible church, he brings the children into covenant with their parents and says "I will be their God." He gives a special order for their instruction, and tells us, by the Psalmist, he did it that they might set their hope in God, and keep his commandments. Here is the place of their spiritual birth. Psalm 87. 5. "And of Zion it shall be said, This and that man was born in her."

When God foretells the prosperity of the church and kingdom of the redeemer he says, Isaiah 28. 9, "Whom shall he teach knowledge and whom shall he make to understand doctrine? Them that are weaned from the milk and drawn from the breasts." Again he says to the church, Isaiah 54. 13, "All thy children shall be taught of the Lord." They shall be taught by those whom

the Lord in his providence, and by his grace shall establish as teachers in his church, and whose labors he will own and bless.

We have the same evidence from Christ himself. Mark 10. 13, 14, 16, "And they brought young children to him that he should touch them. And his disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it he was much displeased and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God. And he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them and blessed them."

Here we see young children brought to Christ. We see Christ much displeased with his disciples when they rebuked those who brought them. He says, Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not. How tender and how emphatical does the blessed Saviour speak! Suffer the little children to come unto me.

When God's visible kingdom was established in the world he made provision for the little children. Being members of this kingdom, Christ owns and acknowledges them. Because of this, they must be brought to Christ. Did the prophet weep? Was Paul filled with great sorrow and continual heaviness of heart, because the unbelieving Jews, with their infant offspring were to be cast out of covenant? And will not our hearts

melt with pity when the little children are not suffered to be brought to Christ, into his covenant and kingdom? It is in vain for any to say these were adult believers. They are called *young* children and *little* children. They were *brought*, and Jesus took them in his arms. Luke says they were *infants*, 18. 15.

And why were they brought to Christ? Matthew tells us, 19, 13, They were brought "that he might lay his hands on them and pray," which was the common mode of blessing. Matthew, Mark and Luke all tell us that Christ said "Of such is the kingdom of God." Had not these children been members of the covenant and kingdom, that is, of the visible church, Christ would not have treated them in this manner. He did not so treat the Syrophenician woman.

Will Jesus then suffer the little children to be neglected now? Has he lost his love for the little children? Will he disown them and be offended because we bring them unto him? No, he has not lost his love for them. He has not left caring for them. He has given directions that they be received in his name. Math. 18. 5. "Who so shall receive one such little child in my name receiveth me." Christ's disciples and his church are to receive them in his name. In his name? How is this? It is to receive them into covenant, and call his name upon them, as the Apostles received the household of Lydia and



the Jailor, and all others to whom they administered baptism. Christ hath not left caring for the little children. What a charge did he give Peter on this subject, after his resurrection? John 21. 15. "Simon son of Jonas lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto him yea Lord thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him feed my Lambs."

He charges him first to feed the Lambs and then to feed the sheep. The Lambs and the Sheep are distinctly mentioned. He will not that the Lambs of his flock should be neglected, "for he gathered them in his arms." The little children, we see are capable of having the covenant seal; they are capable of being brought to Christ, and of receiving blessing from him. They are capable of these things be they never so young. And when they are able to ask their parents, What mean ye by these things? then they must be taught. This truth then is abundantly clear, that one important end for which the visible church was instituted, was the benefit of children.

---

*A summary review of the foregoing Sections.*

ACCORDING to the proof which we have exhibited, the following truths, among many others, appear clear.

The covenant made with Abraham was the covenant of grace. This was the first institution of a visible church in the world, and still remains a permanent institution. Children were included in this covenant. One important end which God had in view, when he instituted a visible church in the world was the benefit of children. Children are capable of being brought into covenant relation with God, and of receiving blessing from him.

When Christ came upon earth, he found them in the church. He gave no order to take them out, but he approved their standing by *declaring* them members of the kingdom of God. They are plainly included in his command for baptism. The same church or kingdom of God was given to the gentiles. The prophecies are explicit with regard to the children of believing gentiles. Evidence of the fact is very clear, that the

children of believing gentiles were baptized, and they have the whole character of baptized persons. The seal of the covenant which was once circumcision, and which signified the same as baptism, and answered the same ends in the church was not changed *suddenly* but *gradually*. The use of the former seal was retained, and used during the whole ministry of the apostles.

In many churches Jews and gentiles were united together, and in all churches had communion with these different seals. The only question, in the apostolic age, about baptism was not, whether infants should be baptized, but whether baptism was as good as circumcision. This was ever answered in the affirmative. The gentiles, who received only baptism are often said to stand on the same ground with the Jews. They are equally the seed of Abraham, and the blessing of Abraham, through Jesus Christ, comes equally upon them. The same church is still continued. The unbelieving Jews, only, who opposed the Gospel were broken off and cast out of covenant. The believing Jews never were broken off, but remained in the enjoyment of all the privileges of the covenant.

When the Jews are again gathered in it must be into the same covenant, church and kingdom of God, when their congregation shall be established and when it shall be with their children as aforetime.

We will here add but a word further : The Jews always knew that their children had an interest in the covenant ; that they had always been owned, received and acknowledged by all their prophets and teachers from the days of Abraham down to Christ ; and that Christ himself recognized them as members of his church. Under the ministry of the apostles the believing Jews must be utterly *deceived* if their children had not the same interest in the covenant, and standing in the church as they had before. Did the apostles, did the Holy Ghost do this to deceive them ? Impossible ! We have then the express authority of the apostles, nay of the Holy Ghost to apply to children, the covenant seal, under the present, as well as under the former dispensation.

From every view of our subject, it is undeniably evident that children have the same standing in the church, under the present as under the former dispensation.

---

## SECTION XV.

*Objections answered, Application, &c.*

**I**T seems needless to answer any objections, since the evidence in every point of

view appears so clear. But lest any should suppose there are seeming difficulties, we will answer one or two, which are considered the most important. It is said, We must believe, and be baptized. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned.—Reply : The terms required of the subject for baptism are no more than those required for circumcision. In both cases faith was required of adults, but in neither case of infants. Abraham must first believe before he might receive circumcision. “He received the sign of circumcision a seal of the righteousness of faith which he had being yet uncircumcised.” Rom. 4. 11. He might not receive the seal of the covenant for himself or for his children until he was a believer. But his children received the seal on condition of *his* faith, and not *their own*. Provision was also made for strangers, that is, profelytes of other nations, to be received into the Jewish church, Exod. 12. 48. What was required of such stranger or profelyte we are informed Isaiah 56. 6, 7. He must join himself to the Lord, must love the name of the Lord, and take hold of his covenant. There was as much required of the adult profelyte to be received into the church then, as was required of any adult in the new testament, for baptism. On this condition he might be received to circumcision, and then to oth-

er privileges : But if he had a family, they must be circumcised upon his faith. The same was also required of every native Jew. "But unto the wicked God faith, What hast thou to do to declare my statutes or that thou shouldest take my covenant in thy mouth." Psalm 50. 16. But faith was not required of infants neither is it required of infants for baptism. Christ did not require faith of those infants which he took in his arms and blessed, and said "of such is the kingdom of God." But when he healed adults he required faith of them. He said "be it unto thee according to thy faith. Thy faith hath made thee whole. Thy faith hath saved thee," &c. Passing the red sea was an act of faith, Heb. 11. 29. but this did not prevent infants.

Faith has ever been required of adults, but never of infants. Those infants which Christ took in his arms were brought to him. And who brought them? Those who had faith to obtain a blessing for them. Christ received and blessed them not according to their own faith, but according to the faith of those who brought them. It is on this account that little children are styled believers by Christ and by the apostles, and are treated as such. Children, by the want of actual faith, are no more disqualified for baptism, than they always were for circumcision. Further: the same argument, which proves against the baptism of

infants, will prove against the salvation of infants. "He that believeth not shall be damned."

It is then certain that faith, as a condition, is required of none but such as are capable of the exercise.

It is said again, If baptism takes the place of circumcision, and the church is the same; Why is not baptism as universal as circumcision? Why is not every child baptized, as every one was circumcised? It is at once acknowledged this ought to be the case. But then, the parents ought first to make the same profession of their faith, their love and their obedience to God. Abraham must first covenant to walk before God in the ways of obedience. All the Jews were required publicly to covenant before God and say, "All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." Exod. 19. 8—24. 3. Deut. 5. 27. They were required to enter into covenant and engage to keep the words of the covenant. Deut. 29. 9. They were required to covenant, "That they should be the Lord's people." 2 Chron. 23. 16. So God commands them, "Ye shall be my people and I will be your God."

In the same manner Christ requires us to profess him before men. "If ye be my disciples, ye will keep my commandments." The only reason, why baptism may not be more extensive, is because parents will not

covenant, to walk before God ; to keep and do his words ; “ to be the Lord’s people.” They will not confess Christ before men, and engage to keep his commandments.— When parents carelessly neglect, or obstinately refuse to do this ; they may not then enjoy any privileges. There is no more required of us to obtain these privileges, than was required of the Jews. God’s requirements are ever the same.

Again ; What good can baptism do a child ? This question is often brought, with an air of triumph, and is considered as an unanswerable objection to Infant baptism. And with as much propriety the Quakers ask, What good can baptism do a believer ? So Naaman demanded, What good it could do him to wash in Jordon ? In the same manner, wicked men often ask, What *good* it can do them, to read the Bible or attend on the preaching of the word, or any other means of God’s appointment ? “ What profit shall we have if we pray unto him ? ” The father of the faithful did not ask any of these questions, respecting himself or his children. His business was immediately to comply with his duty ; and so it ought to be ours. Satan has greatly the advantage, when we are influenced by him to dispute the propriety of God’s requirements.

In answer to their objection however, we may truly say ; The church covenant is a



positive institution, containing promises and privileges for the believer and his seed. When God instituted a visible church, he proposed a covenant for the believer and his seed to enter into, saying, "I will be a God unto thee and to thy seed." He is a covenant keeping God, for the seed, and has made promises to the seed of believers, as well as to believers themselves. He says again; "I will pour my spirit on thy seed and my blessing on thine offspring." And so Christ says, "It is not the will of your heavenly father that one of these little ones should perish." This promise generally speaking must insure to them a state of probation, the means of salvation, and the strivings of God's spirit to apply the truths of his word to their consciences, to work in them repentance, faith, and sanctification. God in his covenant faithfulness puts them into a state of instruction, and discipline most favorable, to the interest of their souls. On this account St. Paul says, "Circumcision verily profiteth." "There is much profit in it every way, chiefly because that unto them were committed the oracles of God." And as much may certainly be said of baptism. Stephen says to the Jews, Acts 7. 51. "Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and in ears ye do always resist the Holy Ghost, as your fathers did so do ye." He is speaking of their wicked ancestors (not

their pious ones) such as made the molten calf, and persecuted the prophets. It is then evident that all these, even the most wicked among them, had the influences of the Holy Ghost, or else they could not have resisted the Holy Ghost. These children, to whom these promises are made, may misimprove these favours, as many have done and so fail of salvation. But, multitudes of others have been brought to a saving acquaintance with God.

As we have seen before, the benefit of children, was one important end which God had in view, in instituting a visible church upon earth. To his covenant people he says, "My spirit which is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth shall not depart out of thy mouth nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed from henceforth and for ever saith the Lord." Isaiah 59. 21. This is the way in which God has, generally speaking, preserved his church from generation to generation, by blessing the seed of believers. This is a precious privilege, secured by covenant promise. But still we are to remember, that God is not confined to any mode nor to any means. He often has and doubtless often will (for he is a sovereign God) made displays of his grace in calling the most vile, and such as are out of covenant. And many who are in covenant (when they abuse

covenant mercy) are left to the hardness of their hearts. Their circumcision becomes uncircumcision, and the same is true of baptism. But we are speaking of what appears, both from his word and from the applications of his grace, to be his general method of working.

The parent also is under covenant obligation to do all in his power, for the spiritual interest of his offspring. This method of bringing children into covenant, gives the parent a great advantage. When he tells the child, I have given you up to God in covenant, it serves greatly to solemnize the mind, prepares the way for spiritual influences, to apply, the parents pious instruction, to the heart of the child. What my son? And what the son of my womb? And what the son of my vows? was urged by the pious mother of king Lemuel, Prov. 31. 2. It is good for parents to be under covenant obligation, to do for their children. We are naturally slothful, and need something to excite us to duty, as much as Lot needed an angel to pull him out of Sodom.

Conversing with a baptist brother on this subject some years ago; he said, "I was once almost persuaded to embrace Infant Baptism, because I thought it good for parents to be under obligation to bring up their children in a religious way. But (continued he) I found if I had love to God I was under as

strong obligation as I could be; giving up my children in baptism could never increase my obligation." In answer to him it was said, We know the covenant strictly speaking does not increase our obligation; but it may and doubtless does increase our sense of our obligation. He was then asked, why he joined to a church and covenanted to walk with God, and watch over the brethren? If love to God superceded every thing else, there could be no need of this; and even the Lord's Supper could be of no service to us, if it did not serve to increase our sense of Christ's love to us, and of our obligation to him. Or in fine why was a church instituted? To these inquiries he could not reply.

Further; The encouragement, which God is giving Christians to offer up their devout prayers for blessings on their seed in covenant, is unquestionably very great. Why did Jacob wrestle with God? God had made promises to him, that he should return to his father's house. This promise that God would be with him, and bring him back in safety was what gave him such confidence, and earnestness in prayer. He was greatly encouraged to pray for that which God had promised him. He was strong in faith, having promises to plead. And when Daniel had found by the prophecies of Jeremiah, that God had made promises to release the Jews from their captivity, after seventy

years, he was encouraged in fervent prayer, that God would fulfil those promises. So the apostles, having received of Christ a promise of the descent of the Holy Ghost, spent the time from his ascension to the day of pentecost, in fervent prayer. It is worth every thing to the Christian, if he can have a promise to plead. So Jeremiah (14. 9.) and Daniel (9. 19.) plead, that they had been called by God's name, literally that God's name had been called upon them. So God encourages his people, 2 Chron. 7. 14.

So the believing parent may be encouraged, and strengthened in his prayers for his children in covenant, because God has made gracious promises concerning them. On this account the covenant with Abraham is so often, by the Apostles emphatically called *the promise*, and the privilege of bringing children into it was ever esteemed so precious.

We here see, in what light we ought to view the divine promises. They are made to encourage us to be in the use of every possible means. To rest in these promises, and be slack in duty, is presumption. We have no reason to believe, that the promise to Jacob would have been fulfilled in that way. He must not only pray, but must send presents to pacify the anger of his brother. When we have done all in our power, then we may rely on the divine promise. God has never made these promises to make us

slack, but to quicken us in duty. And as we ought to be guarded against unbelief on the one hand, so we ought to be guarded against a vain and presumptuous confidence in the promises, on the other.

The goodness of this institution is unquestionably very clear, and the advantages of it very great. And if we did not see the advantages, so long as God has made it our duty we ought to comply. The servants of Naaman came near and said, "My father, if the prophet had bid thee do some great thing wouldest thou not have done it?"

Let us not despise this institution, though it seem a small matter. It is God's appointed way, and how great may be the benefits we cannot tell.

It is said many children are taken, providentially, from their parents while they are very young; they go into the army or they go to sea; they fall in battle or they perish in the waters. They never have much advantage of any means of salvation, and if their lives are spared, they are surrounded with wicked company and vicious examples. Be it so: but God has not confined himself to means. He is able to follow them with his spirit, which he has promised them, and this without doubt he does for he is a covenant keeping God.

Many instances have been known, where persons in this situation have given clear ev-

idence of their conversion. And how many are converted before their death and are not able to give clear evidence of it, we cannot tell. The uncertainty where our children will be, what pursuits they will follow, what company they will keep, and what dangers they will run into, is no reason why we should neglect our duty, but a strong reason why we should perform it; that we may at all times hope in the mercy of God, and be able in our prayers to plead his covenant faithfulness and promise.

Many children are also taken away by early death.

Where is the foundation for the believer's hope for the salvation of these, if it is not in the covenant faithfulness and mercy of God? God hath said, "I will be their God. I will circumcise the heart of thy seed. I will pour my spirit on thy seed."

How can these promises be made good to the seed of believers in covenant, when they die in infancy, or before they are capable of exercising reason and choice, except God sanctifies and saves them? All children are polluted with sin, and need the application of the blood of Christ, and the sanctifying influences of his spirit. How far this grace is or is not extended to children dying out of covenant, we cannot tell. There are many things which give us reason to hope for the salvation of all who die in infancy. God's

tender mercies are over all his works. This also is certain, that God has provided better consolation for his faithful covenant people, than he has for others. To bring children early into covenant, in God's own institution, and a part of his redeeming scheme. To those in covenant and to no other has God said, "I will be a God to thee and to thy seed." His covenant faithfulness cannot fail. "He cannot deny himself. He is faithful that hath promised."

Because these promises have been either overlooked or misapprehended, is evidently a great reason, why many serious christians have either denied or rejected infant baptism. They say there is no promise made for any, but such as have actual, personal faith. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." If this text was designed to require actual faith of infants, and they are excluded from baptism because they cannot have it; then every dying infant is excluded from salvation: for personal faith is as much required for salvation as for baptism. The truth is, personal faith is required only of those who are capable of exercising it. It is never required of infants neither for covenant privileges, nor for salvation. It is one of the great excellencies of God's redeeming scheme, that provision is made for such, as are incapable of exercising personal faith. They may



have representative faith, and on this account they are styled believers.

All objections vanish when we once take a view of the covenant made with Abraham. This (as we said before) was God's own institution, and the privilege and inheritance of every gentile believer.

An inspired penman tells us, "Lo children are an heritage of the Lord, and the fruit of the womb is his reward." And Jesus says, "Suffer the little children to come unto me for of such is the kingdom of God. What duty can be more reasonable, than for us to devote and dedicate those children to God, which we have received from him? Why should we rob God of his own?"

Christian parents, we see our duty, and obligation to give up our dear children to God in covenant, to be faithful to instruct them in the fear of God, in the principles of our holy religion, and importunate in our prayers, that they may be the subjects of God's special grace, and the heirs of his eternal glory. Why will you neglect a privilege so precious? How much do you do for your children that they may appear to advantage in this world? And if they are sick, what anxiety do you feel for their recovery? To afford them relief, you will readily part with every thing you possess. And why will you neglect any thing, which may be for their spiritual advantage? Do not

say, Baptism can do them no good. This is limiting God. It is God's institution, and how much good it may do them you cannot tell. It is certainly unnatural towards them, as well as undutiful towards God for you to neglect them.

All professed christians will also learn their duty, to counsel, admonish, and pray for all children who have been received into covenant by baptism.

A word to the young who have received baptism, will not be deemed exceptionable.

My dear youth, "consider how great things the Lord hath done for you;" that you should be brought into his holy covenant. As you have received the seal of God's covenant, which is the outward sign of regeneration, labor for the thing that is signified thereby. As your parents have devoted and consecrated you to God, so devote and consecrate yourselves to his fear and service. When you are brought thus near to God, cast not yourselves away from him by a wicked and an unholy life.

That Christ may have the dew of his youth, a seed that shall serve him, and a generation for his praise, is the sincere prayer of him who wishes and labors for the salvation of your souls.

A


# T R E A T I S E

ON THE

CONNEXION AND HARMONY

OF THE

OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT  
SCRIPTURES.



---

ACTS xxvi. 22.

Having obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing, both to great and to small, saying none other things than the prophets and Moses did say should come.

SECTION I.

*The Old Testament scriptures were the rule of apostolic preaching.*

**S**T. PAUL, now a prisoner, was under a solemn trial, at the judgment seat of king Agrippa. The charge brought against him was, That he had preached *new* doctrines. It is said, in the preceding chapter, verse 2. "The High Priest, and the chief of the Jews, informed Festus (the Roman Governor) against Paul." But Festus says verse 18. "Against whom, when his accusers stood up, they brought none accusation, of such things as I supposed, but had certain questions against him, of their own superstition, and of one Jesus which was dead whom Paul affirmed to be alive." This they cried up as a new doctrine, and inconsistent with the scriptures. Again 17. 18.

“Some said he seemeth to be, a setter forth of strange gods, because he preached unto them Jesus, and the resurrection.” These were the things, which Paul was accused of preaching, as being new, and inconsistent with the scriptures. This is all that could be proved against him.

In the preceeding chapter, verse 7, it is said “The Jews stood round about, and laid many grievous complaints against Paul, which they could not prove.” All which they could prove against him, which they pretended to be new, was his preaching Jesus; which was dead, whom he affirmed to be alive. Jesus and the resurrection. These things Paul did preach, but, he solemnly denies, preaching any thing, which had not been preached ages before, by the prophets, and of course received, as matters of faith by the people of God.

“Having obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to great, and to small, saying *none* other things than the prophets and Moses did say should come.” Paul does not answer to any one charge particularly, but he makes his defence in the most general terms; that he had never taught, *an individual thing*, but what had been taught, by the prophets and by Moses.

As this point is of much importance, it may be proper, to bring into view a few parallel expressions. Rom. 15. 4. “For

whatsoever things were written afore time, were written for our learning; that we through patience, and comfort of the scriptures, might have hope."

It may be proper here to notice, that the New Testament was not at this time compiled, nor much of it written, and whenever the word *Scripture*, or *Scriptures*, is mentioned in the New Testament, the scriptures of the Old Testament, are meant in distinction, from those of the New. Again; when Paul had quoted a passage, from the writings of Moses, Deut. 30. 12. he said, (Rom. 10. 8.) "This is the word of *faith* which we preach." The apostles preached the *word* of faith, which was contained, in the writings of Moses.

Of the Bereans it is said Acts. 17. 11. "These were more noble, than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word, with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether these things were so." This was when Paul had been preaching to them; and they found, that all his preaching was proved, from the scriptures of the Old Testament.

Jesus Christ preached in the same manner, and stamped the Old Testament scriptures, as a standing rule of divine authority, and so to continue. To the Jews he said Matt. 22. 29. "Ye do always err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God." In the parable of the rich man he says Luke 16.

29. "They have Moses and the prophets let them hear them." By this expression, our Lord fully signifies, that the scriptures of the Old Testament, were a standing rule, whereby men might know the mind, and will of God, and were so to continue. Whenever his enemies caviled with him, and accused him of preaching any thing *new*, or *erroneous*, he instantly appealed, to the scriptures of the Old Testament saying, "Thus it is written," and proved all his doctrines from those scriptures. He commanded saying "search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and *they* are they which testify of me." John 5. 39. All these were the scriptures of the Old Testament, concerning which Paul says, 2 Tim. 3. 16. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the the man of God may be thoroughly furnished, unto every good work."

Peter says, 2 Epist. 1. 19. "We have a more sure word of prophecy; where unto ye do well, that ye take heed, as to a light shining in a dark place."

Again; to qualify his disciples, to preach the gospel of his kingdom, and to enable them, to make the scriptures their unerring guide, Jesus, after his resurrection, gave them the preparation. Luke 24. 45. "Then opened he their understanding, that they



might understand the *scriptures*." The disciples must be *furnished* for the ministry, by having their understandings opened, to understand the scriptures of the Old Testament, because from these they were to preach Christ and his religion. These passages, and many others, are parallel, with what the apostle says in our theme, that he had taught *none* other things than Moses, and the prophets did say should come. Hence we may gain the following important *conclusions*. Con. 1. The scriptures of the New Testament, do not contain a *new* system, different from the Old, but are a continuation of the same plan of divine grace. Con. 2. If any doctrine is *doubtful* in the New Testament, it must be received, or rejected, according to the scriptures of the Old Testament. Con. 3. Whatever doctrine of faith, or practice, is *supposed* to be contained in the New Testament, and is *contrary* to the scriptures of the Old Testament, such supposed doctrine, is not to be received as a New Testament doctrine; but is certainly *erroneous* and *false*.

These conclusions are of much importance, because there are some things, which are clearly settled in the Old Testament, and are not so particularly attended to, in the New. It is the whole bible which makes a compleat system of faith and practice.

---

---

## SECTION II.

*Character of Deity, man's duty, depravity, and  
salvation by Christ.*

CHRISTIAN friend, it may be profitable for thee, to take a particular view, of the doctrines of our faith and practice, and see whether they are established, on the scriptures of the Old Testament according to the rules we have just laid down. If so they are true, if not we must give them up. In doing this we shall act like the noble Bereans, and discover the harmony of both Testaments. Come then candid enquirer, humble seeker after truth, and knowledge, for the confirmation of thy faith. Let us take the view already proposed. The field is large, but *very* pleasant. Here flows "a pure river of the water of life, clear as crystal proceeding out of the throne of God and the Lamb. In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, is there, the tree of life which beareth twelve manner of fruits, and yieldeth her fruit every month,

and the leaves of the tree, are for the healing of the nations.”

1. We will begin with the character of Deity. His natural perfections are proved from the light of nature, but his moral perfections are in the New Testament proved from the Old as we shall soon see.

2. The duty which man owes to God, is conformity to his perfections. This duty is described in the ten commandments, and often elsewhere. The sum of these, is to love the Lord our God, with all our hearts, and our neighbor as ourselves. Our obligation to this duty is founded on the perfections of God, whom to imitate is the perfection and the glory of creatures. 1. Pet. 1. 15. “But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation. For it is *written*, Be ye holy for I am holy.” We may here observe Peter says, “It is *written*.” This was written Levit. 11. 45—19. 2—20. 26. He quotes these scriptures to prove both the holiness of God, and the duty of man.

3. The moral depravity of man, the alienation of his affections from God, the hardness of his heart, the blindness of his mind, his rebellion, pride and opposition to God, the apostle proves from the Old Testament. Rom. 3. 9. “For we have before proved, both Jews and gentiles, that they are all under sin.” As it is *written*, “There is none

righteous no not one : there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are altogether become unprofitable, there is none that doth good no not one." In these and the following words the apostle refers to Psalm 5. 9—10. 7—14. 1, 2—140. 3. and many other places. And to prove, that mankind are in a state of condemnation, under the curse of the law, he says, Gal. 3. 10. "For it is *written*, cursed is every one that continueth not in all things *written* in the book of the law to do them."

4. Salvation by Christ, and by him alone, is taught in the same manner. Christ was promised to our first parents. He appeared to Abraham. He was figuratively represented by all the sacrifices. And the express language of all the prophets is, "I will make mention of thy righteousness even of thine only." Psalm 71. 16. "The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness sake." Isaiah 42. 21. "This is the name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our righteousness." Jer. 23. 5. When Christ walked with two of his disciples, Luke 24. 27. "He expounded unto them, in *all* the scriptures, the things concerning himself." *All* the scriptures contain things concerning Christ.

Peter, Acts 4. 11. proves the sufficiency of Christ alone, from the 118th Psalm, and then says, "Neither is there salvation in any oth-

er, for there is none other name, under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." This was the only name, which ever had been given, since the fall of man. And Paul says, Rom. 11. 26. "As it is *written*; there shall come out of Zion the deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob. For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins." This is quoted from fundry passages in Isaiah. To prove the forgiveness of sins not by works, but by the righteousness of Christ, in the fourth chapter to the Romans, the apostle quotes the 32d Psalm and says, "Even as David described the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works."

The character of Christ as God; as the son of God; his humanity, the circumstances of his birth, sufferings, death, and resurrection were all taught expressly in the Old Testament scriptures. A few expressions we will notice. Psalm 2. 7. "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." 45. 2. 6. "Thou art fairer than the children of men. Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." Here is his divinity. And in the following his humanity and divinity both. Isaiah 7. 14. "Behold a virgin shall conceive, and shall bear a son and shall call his name Emmanuel." 9. 6. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government

shall be upon his shoulders, and his name shall be called, Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." One of the first things in Paul's epistle to the Hebrews, is to prove the divinity of Christ, by quoting the beforementioned words from the 45th Psalm. "Thy throne, O God, is forever, and ever."

The circumstances of his sufferings and death are as plainly taught, Psalm 22. 6. 16. 18. "I am a worm and no man, a reproach of men, and despised of the people. All they that see me laugh me to scorn. They shoot out the lip, they shake the head saying, he trusted in the Lord that he would deliver him. Let him deliver him seeing he delighted in him." "For dogs have compassed me. The assembly of the wicked have inclosed me: they pierced my hands and my feet. They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture." Psalm 27. 12. "False witnesses are risen up against me." 69. 21. "They gave me also gall for my meat, and in my thirst, they gave me vinegar to drink." Isaiah 50. 6. "I hid not my face from shame and spitting." In the 53d chapter of Isaiah we have a description of his death and burial; and of his resurrection, Psalm 16. 10. "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption." When Christ expounded unto his disciples,

“in all the scriptures the things concerning himself,” he could not fail, to point them to these passages which were so plain. By these scriptures, the apostles prove, that Jesus was the Christ. Acts 17. 2. “Paul as his manner was, reasoned with them (the Jews) out of the *scriptures*.” Apollos 18. 28. “Mightily convinced the Jews, by the *scriptures*, that Jesus was the Christ.” To the Corinthians, Paul says, 1 Epist. 15. 3. “For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the *scriptures* : And that he was buried and that he rose again the third day according to the *scriptures*.” The apostle’s preaching was wholly in conformity to the scriptures.

---

### SECTION III.

*Regeneration, Free Grace, Faith in Christ.*

5. **T**HE heart is what God requires. Deut. 6. 4. “Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, with all

thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart." It was the heart, yea it was all the heart which God required. To enforce this requirement, this passage is quoted by our Saviour. Matt. 22. 37.

Again God commanded, Deut. 10. 16. "Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your hearts." 30. 6. "The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live." Similar expressions often occur. Ezekiel 36. 26. "A new heart will I give you. I will put my spirit within you." Our saviour marvels that Nicodemus did not understand the doctrine of the new birth, or a new temper of the heart, when it had been so plainly taught.

6. The doctrine of free grace, is contained in all those declarations, which express the mercy of God, in the pardon of sin. This is the name by which God caused himself to be proclaimed, Exodus 33. 19.—34. 6. "The Lord, the Lord God gracious and merciful." Psalm 85. 10. "Mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other."

To express the fullness of God's grace in the pardon of sin, the mercy seat was erected over the ark of the testimony. The ark was a chest which contained the two tables



of the law. Above, or upon this was the mercy seat, to shew that free grace should triumph over law and justice, and deliver the penitent from the curse. St. Paul proves the free and sovereign grace of God, Rom. 9. 15. from the before mentioned passages out of Exodus. And in his 9th chapter to the Hebrews, he argues the same, from the mercy seat standing above the ark which contained the two tables of the testimony.

7. The necessity of faith for justification, for covenant standing, and for the performance of religious duties, was taught in the Old Testament scriptures; and from them, it is taught in the New.

1. Faith in Christ was required for justification. Gen. 15. 6. "And he (Abraham) believed in the Lord, and he counted it unto him, for righteousness." Psalm 32. 2. "Blessed is he, whose transgression is forgiven, and whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile." These two passages are quoted by the apostle, Rom. 4. 3. to prove justification, not by works, but by the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith.

Again, Habakkuk 2. 4. "The just shall live by faith." This passage is quoted three times to prove justification by faith. Rom. 1. 17. "As it is written, the just shall live by faith." Gal. 3. 6. 11. "Even as Abraham

believed God and it was accounted unto him for righteousness. But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God is evident : for the just shall live by faith." Heb. 10. 38. "Now the just shall live by faith." So particular is the apostle to prove his doctrines by the Old Testament.

2. Faith in Christ was required, in the writings of the prophets, and of Moses as a condition for covenant standing. Abraham was not received into covenant, until he had believed in the Lord, and he had "counted it unto him for righteousness." Psalm 50. 16. "But unto the wicked, God saith what hast thou to do to declare my statutes, or that thou shouldest take my *covenant* in thy mouth." God did never allow a wicked man to be in covenant. The apostle proves the necessity of faith for covenant standing, as he does all his other doctrines, from the Old Testament. Rom. 4. 11. "And he (Abraham) received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, being yet uncircumcised." Abraham might not be received into covenant, until he was a believer. And every one who complied with God's requirement for covenant standing was a Jew inwardly, and had circumcision of the heart, that is faith in Christ. Again ; Rom. 11. 20. "Well because of unbelief they (the Jews) were broken off, and thou (the gentiles) standest by

faith." Hence the apostle ever requires faith for covenant standing, because it ever had been required, from the first institution of the church, in the family of Abraham.

3. Faith was ever required in the writings of Moses and the prophets, as the condition, on which all our religious duties are acceptable to God. That worship which God requires of men is holy, and spiritual, and must be performed with a holy temper, or in the exercise of faith in Christ. No outward acts of external obedience, without holiness of heart could ever please God. Psalm 93. 5. "Holiness becometh thy house O Lord forever." Prov. 15. 8. "The sacrifice of the wicked is abomination to the Lord; but the prayer of the upright is his delight." 21. 4. 27. "The plowing of the wicked is sin." "The sacrifice of the wicked is abomination, how much more when he bringeth it with a wicked mind, (or heart)." Hence the apostle says Heb. 11. 6. "But without faith it is impossible to please him."

At a time when the Jews were very punctual to observe outward duties, when they brought their offerings with much appearance of visible holiness, God says, Isaiah 1. 11. "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts. I delight not in the

blood of bullocks or of lambs or of goats. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hands to tread my courts? Bring no more vain oblations: Incense is an abomination unto me.”

What is the matter now? Did not God require them to bring these offerings? Truly he did, but he required something with them, which they did not bring. He required faith and love; the heart, and all the heart. When their heart was right, when they had the sincerity of faith, then God was pleased with their worship.

Here is an end to the pretended doctrine, that *for the want of faith* infants cannot be baptized; because under the former dispensation, faith was required, as much as under the present. It was required for justification, for covenant standing, and for the performance of every religious duty. It was as much required for *circumcision* then as for *baptism* now. The apostle preaches no other doctrine, but that of Moses and the prophets.

---



---

## SECTION IV.

*Saint's perseverance, resurrection from the dead, perpetuity of God's covenant and church.*

8. **T**HE doctrine of the saint's perseverance was clearly and forcibly taught in the covenant oath which God swore unto Abraham. Moses says, Deut. 7. 9. "Know therefore, that the Lord thy God he is God, the faithful God which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love him." And the apostle says Heb. 6. 13, 17. "For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater he swore by himself. Wherein God willing more abundantly, to shew unto the heirs of promise, the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it with an oath: that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have strong consolation, who have fled for refuge, to lay hold on the hope set before us."

That the believer shall be upheld in grace, and enabled to persevere, depends not on the nature of holiness in his heart; nor on

the merit of his own performances ; nor on the strength of his own exertion ; but on the covenant promise and faithfulness of God. This doctrine, the apostle establishes, on the covenant promises made to Abraham.

9. The resurrection of the dead, and a future judgment, was first taught, by Moses and the prophets, Isaiah 26. 19. " Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they come forth." Dan. 12. 2. " And many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Hosea 13. 14. " I will ransom them from the power of the grave, I will redeem them from death. O death I will be thy plagues, O grave I will be thy destruction."

Our Saviour told Martha, John 11. 23. " Thy brother shall rise again." Her answer was, " I know that he shall rise again at the last day." The doctrine of the resurrection had been fully and clearly taught, and understood. It was denied only by the Sadducees. To confute these, Christ proves and establishes it from the *writings* of Moses. Luke 20. 37. " Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush."

Concerning a future judgment we frequently find such expressions as these. Psalm 1. 5. " The ungodly shall not stand in judgment." 96. 13. " He cometh to judge the earth." Eccl. 12. 14. " God shall bring ev-

ery work into judgment, with every secret thing."

Concerning a future state it is thus expressed Psalm 9. 17. "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." 16. 11. "In thy presence is fulness of joy, and at thy right hand there are pleasures forever more." To prove the blessed and happy state of the righteous in the coming world Paul says, 1 Cor. 2. 9. "But as it is *written*, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." This was written Isaiah 64. 4. So saith Peter, 2 Epistle 3. 13. "We according to his promise, look for new heavens, and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." Take notice how often they say, "As it is *written*," "According to his *promise*," &c.

10. The covenant is perpetual and the church is the same. This was considered in the former treatise, Section V, and here we shall only observe that as the church is the same now as formerly, so the rules for admission, and discipline, are the same now, as under the former dispensation. As we have before seen, faith in Christ, was the condition for covenant standing. All who were admitted were required to profess this. The rule for visible conduct God gave to Abraham which was, "Walk before me and

be thou perfect." This as we have before seen did imply a gracious sincerity.

With regard to church discipline, or dealing with offending brethren, we find such directions as these. Levit. 19. 17. "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart, thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him." The brother, and the neighbour is the same person, as may be seen, Deut. 22. 1, 2, 3, &c. Again Levit. 5. 1. "And if a soul sin, and hear the voice of swearing, and is witness, whether he hath seen, or known of it, if he do not utter it, then shall he bear his iniquity." Prov. 25. 9. "Debate thy cause with thy neighbour himself, and discover not a secret to another." According to these, and other similar passages our Saviour says, Matt. 18. 25. "If thy brother offend thee, go and tell him his fault between thee, and him alone."

The priests were commanded very strictly to put a difference, between the clean and the unclean, Levit. 10. 10.—11. 47, and were severely rebuked of God when they neglected this duty, Ezekiel 22. 26. It was according to these rules, that Christ, and the apostles gave all their directions, about receiving, and disciplining the members of the church.



## SECTION V.

---

*Changes, foretold.*

11. **A**S some changes, must of necessity take place, at the commencement of the gospel dispensation, so these were foretold, viz. the end of the ceremonial law, the change of the priesthood and sabbath.

1. The ceremonial law must cease. This was foretold Psalm 40. 6. "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire : mine ears hast thou opened : burnt-offering and sin-offering hast thou not required. Then said I, Lo, I come : in the volume of the book it is written of me." These words are used by the apostle, Heb. 10. 5. and onward, to prove an end to the law of ceremonies, and sacrifices when Christ should come and suffer.

Again, Daniel 9. 27. "And he (Christ) shall confirm the covenant with many for one week, and in the midst of the week shall he cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease." A day in prophecy, is put for a year. Numb. 14. 34. Ezekiel 4. 6. A week

is seven years. Christ's ministry was half a week, three years and a half. In the midst of the week, he offered himself. Then the law of sacrifices was to cease ; but, the covenant was to be confirmed with *many* during the whole week. Converts were to be numerous, who should be brought into the covenant. This is an important passage: While it foretold the end of the law of sacrifices, at the death of Christ, it also foretold the continuance of the covenant after that time. So the apostle says, speaking of the law of ceremonies, "He (Christ) took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross." It was therefore laid aside as the prophets said it should be.

2. In the seventh chapter to the Hebrews, the apostle argues, and proves the end of the Aaronic priesthood, from the words of the Psalmist, 110. 4. "Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedec." The apostle's argument from these words is this, When this priest, foretold by the Psalmist, should come, the posterity of Aaron should have no more to do, with the priestly office. The law concerning the priesthood is of necessity changed. Others must be appointed, to minister in holy things.

But the law for the support of ministers is for substance the same as before. St. Paul proves this, in the same manner as he does other things, from the writings of Moses.

1 Cor. 9. 9. "For it is written in the law of Moses, thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn." Verse 13. "Do ye not know, that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the Temple, and they, which wait at the altar, are partakers with the altar." The apostle here quotes the law which provided for the support of the priests and then adds, "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel." God ordained that law, as much for the support of ministers under the latter as under the former dispensation. The order of men is changed as was foretold in prophecy, but their support is not taken away. They which minister about holy things, "live of the things of the temple," &c.

When Christ sent forth his disciples to preach, he said unto them, Luke 10. 7. "And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give; for the labourer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house." Christ here establishes the right of a minister's receiving wages, on the principle of the right of any labouring man. God had charged his people in a solemn manner to pay their labourers. Levit. 19. 13. "The wages of him that is hired shall not abide with thee all night." Jer. 22. 13. "Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unright-

eousness and his chambers by wrong ; that useth his neighbour's service without wages and giveth him not for his work." Mal. 3. 5. " I will come near to you to judgment, and will be a swift witness against those that oppress the hireling in his wages." No principle was set forth, as being more just, than the labourer's right, to receive his wages. Christ tells his disciples this right is theirs. The scripture is plain. In writing to Timothy, St. Paul recites to him the before mentioned law of Moses, and the general principle so often asserted in the scripture that the labourer is worthy of his reward. 1 Tim. 5. 17. " Let the elders, which rule well, be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in word and doctrine. For the *scripture* saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn : and the *labourer* is worthy of his reward."

No duty is clearer, than that of a people to pay their minister. He is entitled to a reward for his labour. No *debt* is more sacred, or hath in justice a stronger claim. Can a people then use their minister's service without wages ? Can they withhold, and give him not for his labour, and the *woe* of God not come upon them ? Will not God come near to them to judgment, and be a swift witness, if they oppress, in his wages, him who labours, in word and doctrine ?

A man must either be dishonest, or greatly deluded if he denies his duty in this point.

Again: Ordination, or the visible consecration of ministers, is also the same, under the present, as under the former dispensation. Heb. 5. 4. "And no man taketh this honour unto himself but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." That is, internally by God's spirit, and externally, by a public designation.

3. The change of the sabbath was also foretold. Psalm 95. 6. "O come let us worship and bow down: let us kneel before the Lord our maker, for he is our God, and we are the people of his pasture, and the sheep of his hand. To-day, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your heart." This passage the apostle uses to prove the Christian sabbath, which like the seventh day sabbath, is a type of the heavenly rest. Heb. 4. 4. "For he spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all his works." Verse 7. "Again he limiteth a certain day saying, in (by) David, *to-day* after so long a time; as it is said, *to-day*, if ye will hear his voice harden not your hearts. For if Jesus (Joshua) had given them the true rest, then would he (the Holy Ghost by David) not afterward, have spoken of another day." The apostle first speaks of the seventh day and then says, "Again he limiteth a certain day"

and this certain limited day, is not the seventh ; but “another day” in distinction from the seventh. Having thus proved, the apostle asserts, verse 9, “There remaineth therefore a rest, (sabbatismas a sabbath) unto the people of God.” He closes his argument with the same reason, for the new sabbath, the day limited by the Holy Ghost, as was given for the seventh day. Verse 10. “For he (Christ) that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his.” As God’s resting from the work of creation sanctified the seventh, so Christ’s resting from the work of redemption sanctified the first day. It was limited by the phrase *to-day*. This phrase the Psalmist uses not for the time when he was speaking, but for the day on which Christ should rise from the dead. Psalm 2. 7. “Thou art my son this day, (or to-day) have I begotten thee.” This is explained, to mean the day of Christ’s rising from the dead. Acts 13. 33. “In that he hath raised up Jesus again, as it is written in the second Psalm, Thou art my son this day have I begotten thee.” The same expression is quoted again Heb. 5. 5. and rendered, *to-day*, which is the proper meaning.

Again, Psalm 118. 22, “The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner. This is the Lord’s doing ; it is marvelous in our eyes. This, is the day

(literally to-day) the Lord hath made ; we will rejoice and be glad in it." This passage also is explained to mean the day of Christ's rising from the dead. Acts 4. 10, 11.

In all these passages the original word is the same and properly signifies to-day ; but as was said, just now, is not used for the time when the Psalmist was speaking, but for the day of Christ's rising from the dead ; which is spoken of in these passages, as a day of worship, as " the day which the Lord hath made," or sanctified, a day in which God's people should rejoice :

The apostles understood this phrase *to-day*, to limit, in distinction from the seventh, a certain day of rest, a sabbath unto the people of God. It was to be the day on which the saviour should rise, which proved to be, the first day of the week. Accordingly, it was known in the church, by the distinguished name of, " the Lord's day." On this day, religious congregations assembled together, the ordinances of the New Testament were administered, the voice of Christ was proclaimed, that is, his gospel was preached. Hardened indeed, are *they* who refuse to attend upon and obey the gospel thus preached, or who deny the moral obligation of the *day* limited in prophecy and sanctified by Christ's rising from the dead and entering into his rest.

4. The institution of the Lord's supper, was also foretold, or taught in prophecy.

It will be sufficient here to mention two passages. Psalm 41. 9, is one. "Yea mine own familiar friend in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread hath lifted up his heel against me." This prophecy foretells the act of Judas, in eating the supper with Christ, and then betraying him. Of course, it must undeniably, foretell the institution of that ordinance. So Christ himself quotes and applies it, John 13. 18. "But that the *scripture* may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me." Again, Prov. 9. 1, 5. Wisdom saith, "Come, eat of my bread and drink of the wine which I have mingled." Wisdom here is Christ, and the words plainly foretell that he should institute an ordinance of bread and wine, as we find he did.

These changes the prophets foretold. These things they said should come, and these the apostles did preach, viz. The end of the ceremonial law, the change of the sabbath, the institution of the Lord's supper, and baptism, as we shall next consider.



## SECTION VI.

*The covenant interest of Children.*

THE covenant interest of children, the institution, and mode of baptism, were taught in the writings of the prophets. In the words which we took for our theme, the apostle says expressly, and with the greatest solemnity, that he had taught “*none* other things than the prophets and Moses did say should come.”

The writings of Moses, and the prophets was the *Mount of God*, in which the pattern was shewed, unto the apostles, for the building of the church of Christ. The prophets foretold what should be the rule of preaching under the gospel, and how true ministers should be known from false teachers. Isaiah 8. 20. “To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” They who preach inconsistent with the Old Testament scriptures are destitute of the light of Christ.

One fact which carries irresistible conviction along with it, we will here introduce; It is this. The language of the prophets was, "THUS SAITH THE LORD." But the language of Christ and the apostles was, "THUS IT IS WRITTEN. WHAT SAITH THE SCRIPTURES? THE SCRIPTURE SAITH," &c.

But how is this? Did Paul preach *none* other things, than the prophets, and Moses did say should come? No says Paul, nothing else, having obtained help of God. As we noticed before, Paul had been accused of particular things; but his defence is universal. The writings of the prophets and Moses was the rule of his preaching, and from this rule he says he had never departed.

We will then try the strength of this ground, with the antipedo-baptists side of the question in dispute. Did Moses, or the prophets say that the time should ever come, when the children of believers, should be denied the privileges of covenant interest, and standing? That they should ever be denied the seal of the covenant? These are the proper questions to be asked? And what are their answers? No, truly, no. Neither the prophets nor Moses say any such thing. There is not a syllable of any such thing in all their writings. It is then certain, that Paul never taught any such thing, as our brethren hold. The plain evidence of scripture truth stands directly against them, and they cannot remove it.

Again : Let us try the matter fairly and consider the pedo-baptist's side of the question. Did Moses and the prophets teach and require believing parents to give up their children to God in covenant, and put the *token* of the covenant, the seal of the righteousness of their faith upon them? Truly the prophets and Moses did so teach and so require.

To make this matter plain, we will look among their writings, and see what is said on this subject. Moses in the 17th chapter of Genesis records the whole transaction how God made a covenant with Abraham, and commanded him to put the *tokens* of the covenant upon his children. This *token* St Paul calls, "A seal of the righteousness of faith." Moses further tells us how God promised to be a God unto Abraham, and to his seed thus given up, and how this covenant should endure forever, and how the Gentiles should be brought to the enjoyment of it, under the gospel, as has been shewn before.

And to shew how displeasing it is to God, for parents to neglect this duty, Moses has also left it on record (Exodus, 4th chapter) how God met him in the Inn, and sought to kill him. What! Would kill Moses? Must such a good man as Moses die? Yes Moses must die!! And what had Moses done that he must die?—That God would kill

him too ? He had neglected his duty. He had not given up his children, as God had required, and commanded him to do. Then his wife performed the duty, or caused it to be done, and the Lord let Moses go.

Some people may say, perhaps, it is not so now, God will not kill the parent for not baptizing the children ; if he would he must needs kill very often in these days. In answer to this, God did not always kill people, for not circumcising their children, as we read in the 5th of Joshua and other places. One example of God's displeasure ought always to be sufficient. He did but once bring a flood and but once did he seek to kill a man for neglecting to give up his children in covenant. But for us now, after God has shewn his displeasure, to argue from God's forbearance, that he cares nothing about our obedience, and is not displeas'd with our neglect of duty, is highly presumptuous. God may bear long and be kind yet he is equally displeas'd with us, if we neglect our duty as he was with Moses.

Again ; Moses in the 29th chapter of Deuteronomy, leaves it on record how he took the children of Israel as God commanded him, and, required them old and young, parents and babes, to enter into covenant, or rather to renew covenant with the Lord, verse 10.

Infants were included, in all great cove-

nant transactions, and according to God's institution, were capable of entering into covenant, and were required so to do, and no man has a right to deny what God requires. Also in the 30th chapter of the same book, Moses foretells the present dispersed state of the Jews, and their return; and mentions their seed or offspring. Such is the light which Moses gives on this subject.

We will now consider, a few passages from the prophets, and close this section. Psalm 127. 3. "Lo, children are an heritage of the Lord, and the fruit of the womb is his reward." The heritage of the Lord is his church. 1 Pet. 5. 3. "Neither as being Lords over God's heritage."

The prophet Isaiah foretelling the coming of Christ and the gospel day says, (22. 24.) "And they shall hang upon him all the glory of his father's house, the offspring and the issue." The offspring and the issue shall be hung upon Christ. They belong to God's house which is the church. Heb. 3. 5. "And Moses verily was faithful in all his (God's) house. But Christ as a son over his own house;" that is the church.

The success of the gospel, and the ingathering of the gentiles into the church is foretold, Isaiah 49. 22. "Behold I will lift up my hand to the gentiles and set up my standard to the people; and they shall bring their

sons in their arms and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders." 65. 20. "They are the seed of the blessed of the Lord and their offspring with them." Jer. 30. 20. "And it shall be with their children as aforetime, and their congregation shall be established before me." All these and many others which might be mentioned are clear prophecies of the gospel day, and expressly mention that children must be in the same circumstances as they were before. So when infants and little children were brought to Christ he said, "Suffer the little children and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of God." This expression, "the kingdom of God," usually means the visible church, and in this place evidently; because the New-Testament is spoken in conformity to the Old, where God in his holy and everlasting covenant had fixed the standing of believer's children.

Further: The apostles considered the testimony of prophecy a *command* for them, to go and preach the gospel to the gentiles, Acts 13. 47. If then a prophetic promise was a command to them to preach the gospel to the gentiles, it was also a command to them to bring the children into covenant with their parents, for the prophets speak plainly with respect to children. They say "For so hath the Lord commanded us," and repeat the prophecy which contained the

promise. They have shewn us in what light they considered, and in what light *we must* consider a prophetic promise. It is a command from the Lord.

---

## SECTION VII.

*Mode of baptism. Arguments for immersion insufficient.*

**T**HE main argument, used by dipping baptists, is from the greek word baptizo, which is sometimes translated wash, and sometimes baptize. It is used for the christian ordinance, for ceremonial, and for traditional purification. Mr. Merrill says page 20, "Bailey's Dictionary speaking of baptism, or rather the place, where persons were baptized, says, Baptistry is either the place, or vessel, in which persons are baptized." In the same page, he says again, "Baptism signifies to dip, immerse or wash the body all over. To baptize signifies to plunge under water, to dip, or wash the body all over. To be baptized signifies to be plunged immersed, or washed all over."

Page 21. "I have searched in several Dictionaries, and read many authors upon the words (baptizo and louo) yet have not found one Dictionary, which has given a definition of the words different from what I have given." In a note, at the bottom of the same page, he says "since writing the above, I have met with Cole's Latin Dictionary, which gives one English of the word baptizo to sprinkle."

Page 29. "The plain, literal, and common, signification of the word, is to immerse overwhelm, dip, or plunge all over. "There appears to be <sup>no</sup> evidence, that it is ever, so much as once, <sup>used</sup> in any part of the bible, to signify the application of water, in any other sense."

Page 45. "I do not find, that baptizo is used in any place, for washing hands, or for washing, or dipping a part of the body, or any other thing."

Page 53. "Baptizo signifies to dip, wash the body all over."

Page 54. "The merit of the *whole subject* depends greatly, if not intirely, upon the determinate meaning, of the words, which our Lord used, in the institution of the ordinance, and when speaking of it."

These are not arguments, but assertions, and their truth, we will candidly examine. Solomon says Prov. 18. 17. "He that is first, in his own cause *seemeth* just; but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him." In



these declarations, Mr. Merrill has made some sad mistakes. Bailey's Dictionary, for instance, does not say as he says it does, but says thus. "Baptism, *washing, or purifying.*" "Baptistery, *a basin or font to baptize in.*" "To baptize, *to administer the sacrament of baptism, to christen.*"

Bailey's Dictionary has had many editions. The one in my possession is the eleventh. I have examined two others and find them uniform. Now it is possible, and I charitably hope Mr. Merrill has seen some edition, which says as he says it does, but I confess, I greatly doubt it, because he seems to be *inclined*, (I hope from an honest; though misguided zeal) to make mistakes. He asserts, that he could not find one dictionary, which had given a definition of the word; different from what he had given, and then confesses he *had* found one. Why he had not found many I cannot tell except from the reason just given. Johnson's Dictionary defines it thus, "Baptism, *is given by water and that prescript form of words which the church of Christ doth use.*" Mr. Webster's which is undoubtedly a work of great merit, defines it thus, "Baptism, *a washing, or sprinkling with water, a holy ordinance, a sign of admission into the church.*" These definitions say nothing of plunging, and are *not* such definitions, as Elder Merrill has given; and why he should say, he had searched several Dictionaries, and

read many authors, and had not found one, which had given a definition of the words different from what he had given, is strange indeed ! It is true some Dictionaries mention plunging, as one sense of the word, and some mention sprinkling ; but most Dictionaries define the word much as Bailey's and Johnson's without mentioning any mode, in which the water is applied. I have not found one, and presume Mr. Merrill cannot, which defines the word, as he does, to mean plunging *only*. The plain fact is, his definition is not according to *any* Dictionary.

After all, the scripture is the place, to find the meaning, of scripture words ; and if the word baptizo had been uniformly translated, that is always to wash, or always to baptize, there would have been no difficulty. The indifferent use, of the words *wash* and *baptize* in the English, where we have baptizo in the Greek, prevents the common reader, from getting the sense of the word, so easily as otherwise he would.

In his more than sixty pages, on the mode of baptism, and chiefly, on the meaning of the word baptize, he has not produced, a single instance, of the fact that any person, in the days of Christ, and the apostles, ever went all over under water, to be baptized. He has not produced a single instance, where it is known any way, that the word means immersion.

Baptizo, louo, nipto, rantizo, pluno, and kluzo, are used to express washing, cleansing, and purifying; but none of these, has in itself any determinate signification, about the mode of washing, except rantizo, which signifies to sprinkle. Pluno is the word, commonly used, for washing clothes, and things, which are commonly put all over under water, and is used also in some instances parallel with rantizo. Both words are used in the septuagint (Psalm 51. 7.) referring to the same thing:

The other words, just mentioned, are used, in some instances for slight and partial washing, and in other instances parallel with rantizo. Nipto is more commonly used for washing the hands, but not always. In some instances, baptizo is used for washing of hands before meals, and is parallel with nipto. In other instances, louo, is used for baptizo, and this again, is parallel with rantizo to sprinkle; and in other instances, baptizo and baptifmos its correspondent noun, are used evidently to express sprinkling itself.

The Jews say unto Christ, Matt. 15. 2. "Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders, for they, nipfontai, wash not their hands, when they eat bread." Christ had taught his disciples, to observe the law of Moses, but he had never taught them to observe the *traditions* of the elders.

The same complaint is brought again, Mark 7. where the words, *nipito*, *baptizo*, and *baptismos* are used interchangeably, and parallel with each other. Verse 2 "And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread, *anipitois*, with defiled (that is to say unwashen) hands, they found fault." 3, "For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they, *nipfontai*, wash their hands oft they eat not." 4, "And when they come from the market, except they *baptifontai* (are baptized) wash they eat not, and many such things there be, which they have received to hold, as the (baptifontai) washings of cups, and pots, brazen vessels and tables." 5, "Then the Pharisees and the scribes asked him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat bread, *anipitois*, with unwashen hands." Again, Luke 11. 38. "And when the Pharisee saw it, he marveled that he (Christ) had not first (*ebaptifontai* been baptized) washed before dinner."

Here then, any one may satisfy himself, whether Elder Merrill is right, or whether (as I said) he is inclined to make mistakes. He says, *Baptizo* signifies to dip, immerse, or plunge the body all over in water; is never used, for any thing short of it; is never used for washing the hands, nor apart of the body, but it means washing the *whole* body, and putting it all over under water. Contrary to these assertions, we find, that

baptizo and nipto are actually used interchangeably, for washing the hands, but neither of them expresses any mode. The ancient mode of washing hands, among the Jews, was by pouring water on them." Elisha poured water on the hands of Elijah, 2 Kings 3. 11.

Further; as when the woman poured ointment on Christ's head, and his *body* is said to be anointed, so here when the hands are washed; and no mode mentioned, though probably by pouring too, not the hands *only*; but the person *wholly*, is said to be washed. The Pharisee did not marvel, that Christ's hands had not been washed, (though the water would have been applied to his hands only) but, that *he*, the man himself, had not first washed, literally been baptized. Applying water to the hands, is here considered washing, or baptizing the man. This is unequivocal, and decisive evidence, that baptizo does *not* signify as Elder Merrill, says "To dip, plunge immerse the whole body all over under water." It is positively used for applying water to the hands *only*, though he says, he can find no such instance in the bible. And if the word is used, for applying water to the hands only, it may be used for applying water to the face only.

Mr Merrill says again page 17 "Whenever baptism is mentioned, and neither the word baptizo, nor baptismos is used, the word

substituted plainly shews, that baptizing, or washing the body all over, is the mode, for this is the meaning of *louo*, which is the word, and the only word, which the scriptures employ, in the room of *baptizo*." That this word is used parallel with *baptizo* is granted; but that it is the only word, so used is not granted; neither is it granted, that this word signifies to wash the body all over. We have evidence to the contrary. It does not, of itself, express any mode of washing. It is often used, for applying water to a part of the body, and like *baptizo* is used parallel with *rantizo*, where it means, *only* pouring, or sprinkling.

When Jesus had poured water, into a basin to wash his disciples' feet, Peter said, John 13. 10. "Not my feet only but my hands and my head. Jesus said unto him, *o leloumenos*, He that is washed, needeth not, save *nipfathai* to wash his feet, but is clean every whit." Here both *louo*, and *nipto*, are used not for washing the body all over, but for washing the feet *only*; and this probably was done by sprinkling, because sprinkling was the common mode of purifying, and it would seem impossible, to dip so many feet into a basin.

*Louo* is here used, not as Elder Merrill says, for washing the body all over, but for washing the feet *only*, and the person (as in the case of washing hands) the man *he* is ac-

counted washed, and cleansed, "He that is washed needeth not, save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit." He is accounted washed all over. He is not *dipped* all over, but is *clean* all over. Nipto and louo are both used, in this verse, for the same thing, with out any other reason, than for the sake of elegance, and variety, in which the original scriptures greatly abound, and the effect is expressed by katharos, the adjective corresponding with katharizo, which increases the variety. He that is washed, needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean, katherized, every whit. This verb katharizo, is the same also, which is used, to express the effect, both of rantizo, to sprinkle and baptizo, to baptize, which evidently makes them parallel. Eph. 5. 26. "That he might sanctify, and katharise as cleanse it (the church) with the washing of water, by the word."

Acts 16. 33. "And he took them the same hour of the night, and cloufen washed their stripes." This was not dipping their bodies all over under water; neither was it taking the stripes and dipping them; the nature of the case determines that it was sprinkling, or pouring. If elder Merrill's argument, or rather assertion be true, about the use and meaning of these words, then it is certain, that the jailor dipped Paul all over under water, when he washed his stripes, and then when Paul baptized the jailor, he dipped him all over, and so they

had a business of it, first one and then the other. For *louo*, which is here used, Mr. Merrill says, is equivalent to *baptizo*, the word, and the only word, which the scriptures employ for it, and signifies to dip the body all over, and on the definite meaning of these words, the merit of the whole subject, greatly if not entirely depends. Of course the merit of the whole subject entirely fails.

Heb. 10. 22. "Having our hearts *errantismenoi* sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies *leloumenoi* washed with pure water." Here is both the internal baptism, and the external. The external, is only a type, or visible expression of the internal. *Rantizo*, and *louo*, are used, as being perfectly adapted to each other, as if it had been said, Having our *hearts* sprinkled from an evil conscience and as a visible sign of it, our *bodies* are sprinkled with pure water. I say *rantizo* and *louo*, sprinkling and washing, are used evidently as being entirely adapted to each other.

Another instance, equally plain, is Rev. 1. 5. "Unto him that loved us, and *loufanti* washed us, in his own blood." If we compare this, with other passages, we find that this washing in the blood of Christ, is sprinkling. Heb. 12. 24. "And to the blood *rantismou* of sprinkling." 1 Pet. 1. 2. "And unto *rantismon*, sprinkling, of the blood of



Jesus Christ." What then is the difference between being washed *in* and sprinkled *with* the blood of Jesus Christ? Surely none. Louo in one text is used to express the same as rantizo, or its correspondent noun in the other, that is sprinkling. Why Elder Merrill should, right in the face of scripture, affirm as he does, that the words baptizo and louo signify to dip, to plunge, to immerse the whole body all over under water, that they are never used so much as once, in any part of the bible, for washing the *hands*, nor a part of the body, nor for any thing short of a total immersion of the whole body, is strange indeed!

Again; Mr. Merrill acknowledges, that baptism and washing are the same thing. Page 23, "Baptism and washing appear to be used as synonymous words, or as signifying the same thing." This he is obliged to acknowledge, because the translators of the bible, have in so many instances translated the word baptizo into the word wash. But did the translators of the bible mean to have us understand that washing means plunging, and only plunging as elder Merrill defines baptism? Or did the translators of the bible mean to have us understand, that *religious washing* is parallel with sprinkling? They tell us that Christ's feet were washed with the tears of one woman, but do they mean to have us understand they were plunged?

Again ; Aaron was consecrated to the priest's office by washing. Exodus 29. 4. "And Aaron and his sons, thou shalt bring unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and thou shalt wash them with water." This washing is found to be sprinkling. Numb. 6. 8. "Take the Levites, from among the children of Israel, and cleanse them, and thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them, Sprinkle water of purifying upon them." This was the law for the consecration of the priests to their office, they must be washed, that is sprinkled with the water of purifying. This was not clean water but a mixture. Numb. 19. 9. 17. It is then plain that the scripture idea of religious washing is by sprinkling.

Again, Psalm 51. 7. "Purge with hyssop and I shall be clean, wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." If we compare this with Levit. 14. 6, we find that this washing means sprinkling. In certain cases, God had commanded that people should be sprinkled with hyssop, as a token of their being cleansed by the blood of Christ.

Again ; as the dipping baptist says, "The merit of the whole subject depends greatly if not altogether on the meaning of the words," we will consider one or two cases more. 1. Cor. 10. 1. "Moreover brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud,

and all passed through the sea, and were all baptized unto Moses, in the cloud, and in the sea." But in what mode were these Jewish fathers with their households baptized? Certainly they were not plunged; because we are expressly informed that they went through on dry land. Exod. 14. 16. 22. Heb. 11. 29. The waters went back, by a strong east wind, all that night. Dry land was *under* them, *before* them, and *behind* them; and if water was on each side of them, it was at so great a distance, that those only, who were on the out side of the host, could see it. The Psalmist speaking of this very time saith, 77. 17. "The clouds *poured out* water." And we know that such a strong wind as took away the sea would carry a mist along with it, which would sprinkle them. Thus were they baptized, by having water *poured* on them from the cloud, and by a vapour from the sea. This passage Elder Merrill has been careful to leave out of his book.

Once more, Heb. 9. 10. "Which stood in meats, and drinks, and divers washings," diaphorois baptismois, divers baptisms. This is spoken of the Jewish ritual. Mr. Merrill thinks, the apostle here, might refer to the law, which in certain cases required bathing. But bathing does not necessarily mean plunging. A person may bathe with a very little water, and there is no evidence, that any

person, under the former dispensation, did ever plunge all over in water. In the before mentioned passage the apostle evidently, comprehends all the various ceremonial cleansings, which with few exceptions of bathing we know were sprinklings; and bathing it is evident was not immersion. Mr. Pool, a critical and able expositor, explains, "divers washings" or baptisms as it is in the Greek, thus. "Which were many for the priests in their services, and for others in performing theirs by them. Some by sprinkling with blood, Exod. 29. 20. 21. And with water, Numb. 8. 7. and 19. 9. to 20. Some by washing at the brazen Laver, Ex. 29. 4. 30. 18. 21. So the sprinkling of the healed lepers, Levit. 14. 7. 9, and the purification of the unclean." So the apostle verse 13. says, "If the blood of bulls, and of goats and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ?" Verse 19. "With water and scarlet wool, and hyssop *sprinkled* both the book and all the people. Moreover he *sprinkled* with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry." Thus we are authorized, not only by the greatest commentators, but by Paul himself, to understand that these divers baptisms, mean sprinklings.

We further learn the meaning of the word baptize, from its being used, to express

the operations of God's spirit on our hearts. We are said to be baptized of the Holy Ghost, John 1. 33—baptized by the spirit, 1. Cor. 12. 13. But in other scriptures the spirit is said to be poured out, poured upon, shed forth, and fall as the rain and as the dew; and is called, The *sprinkling* of the heart, which makes baptizing and sprinkling the same thing. This will not agree to plunging.

Trials and afflictions are by similitude, called a baptism and a cup. Luke 12. 15. "I have a *baptism* to be baptized with." John 18. 11. "The *cup* which my father hath given me, shall I not drink it." Christ tells his disciples, that they also should have their share of afflictions. Mark 10. 39. "Ye shall drink of the cup that I drink of, and the baptism that I am baptized withall, shall ye be baptized." But these trials which are called a baptism, are expressed, by the *pouring out* of God's wrath, by the *pouring out* of his fury, by the *pouring out* of his indignation, by the *pouring out* of the vials of wrath, &c. The same trials are called a cup, and in other scriptures are expressed, by "the cup of God's wrath;" and by the wine of the wrath of God *poured out* without mixture into the *cup* of his indignation. These expressions are figurative, and in some instances, the figure is exceedingly striking and bold; as where David describes his trials, or

perhaps prophetically the trials of Christ. Psalm 42. 7. "Deep calleth unto deep, at the noise of thy waterspouts, all thy waves are gone over me." 69. 1. "Save me O God for the waters are come into my soul. I am come into deep waters where the floods overflow me." In the first of these passages (and they both represent the same scene) the figure begins with pouring. The water spouts are heavy showers, falling from the clouds, until they make a deluge; and if we take the mode of baptism from *hence*, we must begin with pouring, and continue the operation, until the person baptized is overwhelmed, until the waves and floods have gone over him. But if we take the passages, collectively, to which this baptism and cup of affliction refer, they plainly point us to pouring, or sprinkling, for the meaning of the word baptize.

Again, *bapto*, *dupro* or *duno*, are the words which properly signify to dip, plunge &c: but neither of these, is used for, nor parallel with *baptizo*, as we find *louo*, *nip-to*, and *rantizo* are; which is another clear argument that *baptizo* signifies, not to dip but to sprinkle.

We will close our observations on this argument, by shewing what form of expression would have been satisfactory, and indeed necessary, to prove immersion, or washing the body all over, to be the mode

of baptism. If either of the words, which *properly* signifies to dip, or plunge, as *bapto*, *dupto*, *duno*, &c. had been used for *baptizo*, or parallel with it, the evidence would have been sufficient, or if *baptizo* had been compounded with *peri*. We want such an expression, as we find in the book of Judith 10. 3. "And she pulled off the sackcloth which she had on, and put off the garments of her widow hood, and washed her body all over with water." This is equal to Elder Merrill's definition of the word *baptizo*. Every part of the text supports the idea, that she washed all over, and leaves no room to doubt the fact. She put off her clothes to do it. But in the septuagint, the word which signifies washing all over, is not *baptizo*. It is a word of a larger extent, compounded of *peri* and *kluzo*, *soma* her body, *perieklufto* she washed all over, *udati* with or in water. Simple verbs express only a simple action; but the circumstance of an action is expressed by some other word, and usually in the greek language, by a preposition compounded with the verb. For instance, *baino* signifies simply to go, *anabaino* to go up or ascend, *katabaino* to go down or descend, *sunbaino* to go in company with others. So *baptizo*, *louo*, *nipto* and *kluzo* express the act of washing simply, but no circumstance of washing. To express washing all over, which is a circumstance of wash-

ing, they must be compounded with *peri*, as in the case of *Judith*. *Peri* in Greek is the same as *circum* in Latin, which we use with some of our English words, to alter the sense in the same manner. For instance, the verb *scribe*, signifies to mark, or fit one piece, or thing to another, without expressing the least circumstance of such a mark, whether it is long, or short, straight or crooked. But when compounded with *circum* the meaning is altered. *Circumscribe* signifies, to surround, to enclose, to make a circle, &c.

Now if we could find one instance, in the New Testament, where any person had put off or changed clothes for the purpose of baptism, as *Judith* did for her washing, and where the verb *baptizo* was compounded with *peri*, so as to express washing the body all over, the evidence would be satisfactory, but nothing of this is to be found, and *baptizo* alone, no more signifies washing the body all over, than the English verb *scribe* signifies to enclose or make a circle. The evidence then from the meaning of the word, is insufficient to prove more than sprinkling, or common washing of the hands.

2. Mention is made, in a few instances, of going into, and coming out of the water, of being baptized in *Jordan*, in the river of *Jordan*, &c. As great multitudes were baptized, if baptism was administered by sprinkling, it would be very convenient, in the



simple state of their manners, to step down into the edge of the water, where the minister might take up some with his hand. This is as *much* as those expressions will prove. Going *into* the water does not prove going all over *under* water. Indeed these expressions will not prove going into the water, in the least degree. It has been shewn, once and again, by sprinkling baptist writers, that the translators of the bible, have translated the original words, *en* and *eis*, promiscuously into the English words in, into, at, by, near, unto, &c. And *apo* is as promiscuously translated into the English words, out of, from, away, &c. The original words are indefinite. This has not been denied by writers on the other side. So the *English* words in and into are indefinite in *their* meaning. The expression, *Into* the mountain, occurs more than fifty times, when the meaning is *upon* the mountain. Bailey's Dictionary says, as we have noticed before, Baptistry is a basin or font to baptize *in*. He considers it correct to say, A basin to baptize *in*, but he does not mean immersion. He means simply, taking water from the basin with the hand. So it is said, 1 Kings 22. 38. "And he washed the chariot *in* the pool of Samaria." This was king Ahab's war-chariot, a great and stately car; and when it is said to have been washed *in* the pool, the meaning is at, or near to, and with some of the wa-

ter of the pool ; because the dogs licked the blood which was washed off from the chariot, which they could not have done, if it had been plunged in the pool.

3. There are two passages which speak of being buried with Christ by baptism and are thought by some to favour immersion. Rom. 6. 4, is one, " Therefore being buried with Christ by baptism, into death, that like as Christ was raised up by the glory of the father, so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together, in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection. Knowing this that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should no more serve sin." Col. 2. 12, is similar. This passage is highly figurative. Burying, planting and crucifying are alluded to in baptism. Planting in scripture, is setting out trees, herbs and vines, called plants. These being different figures, it is impossible, in the mode of baptism, to imitate more than one of them, in one operation. But all are required to be imitated, or none ; all cannot be ; therefore none is required. Indeed it is improper in the mode, or ceremony of baptism, to imitate either of them. Mr. Henry in his exposition of the Bible expounds this passage in the following words. " Our conformity (to Christ) is complete, we are in profession

quite cut off, from all commerce and communion with sin, as those that are buried are quite cut off from this world: not only, not of the living but no more among the living, having nothing to do with them. Thus must we be, as Christ was, separate from sin and sinners. We are buried, viz. in profession and obligation. We profess to be so, we are bound to be so. It was our covenant engagement by baptism; we are sealed to be the Lord's, therefore to be cut off from sin. Why this burying in baptism, should so much as *allude* to any custom of dipping under water in baptism, any more than our baptismal crucifixion and death should have such reference, I confess I cannot see. It is plain that it is not the *sign*, but the thing *signified*, that the apostle here calls being buried with Christ." It is not, says he, the *sign*, i. e. ceremony but the thing *signified* by baptism, which the apostle calls being buried with Christ. When we, in the same baptism, are said to be crucified with Christ, it implies that we must *ascend* a cross and be fastened there, as much as when we are buried with him, we must be put under water. He might have added, When by the same baptism, we are said to be planted in the likeness of his death, we must be baptized in the mode of *planting*.

4. Heb. 10. 20, is thought by some to favour immersion. "Having our hearts sprink-

led, from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." Washing and sprinkling, we have before seen, is the same thing in scripture, and when a part is washed the whole is said to be clean, as in the case of washing hands, and feet. So when a box of ointment was poured on Christ's head, (Matt. 26. 27. Mark 14. 28.) he speaks of it, as being poured on his *body*, and as anointing his *body*.

5. The example of Christ, is urged in favour of immersion. He was plunged, say the dipping baptists, and we must follow his example, and go into the water. But there is no evidence in the bible, that Christ was plunged, nor that any body else was plunged. The main argument, which is from the word baptizô, is insufficient to prove it. The word baptism is sometimes used, *evidently*, for sprinkling, and *never, evidently*, for plunging; and the particles *in* and *into* as we have seen before are too indefinite to afford any proof. Christ's baptism was a law requirement, as a part of his consecration to the office of the ministry. He must enter on it, at the age of thirty years. Numb. 6. 4. 23. Luke 3. 23. He was as capable, and as well qualified at twenty, as at thirty, but he must be conformed to the law; and the law which required all the priests to be baptized, or washed did require them to be sprinkled. Exod. 40. 12. Numb. 8. 7. They must be

sprinkled with the water of purifying and what this was we are informed, Numb. 19. 9. 17.

6. Because John baptized, at Jordan, which was a great river, and at Enon because there was much water, some have thought this was an evidence of immersion. But Jesus (John 3. 26. 4. 1.) made, and baptized more disciples than John (though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples) and neither Jesus, nor his disciples went to these places. Baptism could be performed any where. It is evident, that John did not go to these places, because they were more convenient, for baptizing than others. He might have baptized in any place. Indeed John did not always baptize, at Jordan, and Enon. He began to baptize in Bethabara *beyond* Jordan, where we read of *no* river. John went to those places, to fulfil the prophecy, which declared him, "The voice of one crying in the wilderness." And the multitudes, which came to hear him preach, wanted much water for other uses besides baptism.

Further : As we have before shewn, that baptizo to baptize, and katharizo to purge, cleanse, and purify, are used synonymously, we will notice a particular instance. John 3. 25. "Then there arose a question between some of John's disciples, and the Jews, about purifying. And they (the Jews) came to John, and said unto him, He to whom,

thou bearest witness, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him." The question was about purifying or baptizing, the words are used interchangeably. And it was not about the mode of purifying, this had been settled in the law; but it was about the person, who had a proper right to perform the service. *He baptizeth i. e. purifieth, and all men come to him.* It is then evident that the baptism which John administered, and which the disciples of Christ administered, previous to his sufferings, was but a legal or ceremonial purification. And the manner of the Jews to purify, was with water pots containing two or three firkins apiece. A firkin is one fourth of a barrel. Indeed John's and Christ's ministry was under the ceremonial dispensation, and each of them observed the Jewish ritual.

---

### SECTION VIII.

*Circumstances, necessarily connected with immersion, are wanting.*

**I**N all the accounts, of baptisms, recorded in the bible, those circumstances are positively wanting, which are necessarily

connected with immersion. Of course all the evidence in favour of that mode is insufficient to render it even probable.

If we attend a dipping baptist now, we find there are some circumstances peculiar to immersion. Such as going from the place of public worship, changing and rechanging of clothes, &c. At the close of worship, mention is made, that baptism will be administered at such a place, and at such a time. Perhaps in a quarter of an hour, if the place is near, or half an hour if farther off. This time is taken up in getting ready, and in going thither. The people, as many as can, repair to the place too, and the persons to be baptized appear *generally*, in a different dress, from what they had on before; and after being plunged, they change their clothes again. We find also, that those who practise immersion are often obliged to delay baptism, on account of extremity of the weather, sickness and bodily infirmity, either of the administrator, or of the person to be baptized.

Now it is no where said that any one was dipped, plunged, immersed, washed all over, or went all over into the water. Neither is there any mention of such circumstances, as are necessarily connected with immersion.

John, whose ministry was but about a year and an half is supposed to have baptized about two millions of people. Matt. 3.

6. "Then went out unto him Jerufalem and *all* Judea and *all* the region round about Jordan. And were baptized of him." The fhortnefs of his miniftry, *forbids* the idea, that John could baptize fuch vaft multitudes by immerfion. It would be fcarcely poffible if he was in the water the whole of his time.

Jesus alfo made, and baptized more difciples than John, though Jesus himfelf baptized not, but his difciples. But they never frequented rivers and large collections of water. *They*, it feems, could baptize any where and on the *fhorteft* notice. To have baptized fuch multitudes by immerfion, muft have been a work of labor in which they muft have fpent the moft of their time. But we find this was not the cafe. Their time was fpent in teaching or preaching the word. Though they baptized fuch multitudes, it feems to have been no hinderance, nor inconvenience. Thefe things to a candid mind, certainly render immerfion *incredible*.

When the three-thoufand were baptized, Acts 2d, Peter began to preach, at the third hour of the day, and we cannot reasonably fuppofe, that he and the others, began to baptize, until fometime in the afternoon. Yet there was fufficient time, to baptize the three thoufand on the fame day. This was at Jerufalem, where there was no river, and we have no intimation, that there was *any* place convenient to immerfe fuch a multitude.



Such an event was unexpected, both by the apostles and by the people. The people of course were not prepared for such an event, with changes of clothes, or if they were we have no intimation that they did change them, nor of their going away, nor of one circumstance necessarily connected with immersion; but such circumstances are brought into view, as render immersion *incredible*; particularly the shortness of the time and the place where they were.

Cornelius, it appears was baptized at home, in his own house. Acts 10. 47. Peter says, "Who can forbid water, that these should not be baptized?" Not, who can forbid water to run in a river, or stand in a pond; but, who can forbid, to bring water, for their baptism?

Saul appears to have been baptized, in the house of Judas, where Ananias found him. He had been three days without meat and drink. Besides his fasting, he had been exercised with violent conviction, which must have brought him to be very feeble. He is now required to be baptized, before he eats, or drinks. He is not required to go away but to *rise up*, and this, probably, was as much as he could do. Acts 9. 18. "And he received sight forthwith and *arose* and was baptized." 22. 16. "*Arise* and be baptized."

If no other, the case of the Eunuch, Acts

8. 33, where it is said, "They went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch and he baptized him," is considered by the dipping baptists to afford proof of immersion. Let us consider it. As Philip was travelling, he found the Eunuch sitting in his chariot, with his bible in his hand. He was reading a prophecy concerning Christ, which began at the 13th verse of the 52d chapter of Isaiah, and continued through the 53d chapter. He was now considering the 7th and 8th verses of the 53d chapter. At *this* scripture, Philip began and preached Christ to him. Doubtless the Eunuch had read the whole prophecy, and doubtless Philip explained the whole. Near the beginning of the prophecy it was foretold that Christ should institute baptism, by sprinkling. "Behold my servant shall deal prudently, he shall be exalted, and extolled, and be very high. So shall he sprinkle many nations." As they travelled along, they came to a certain water, and the Eunuch said, "See here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?" Philip, it seems, had explained this ordinance to him, or he would not have asked that question. And it would be natural for him to do it, because it was in the prophecy from which he had been preaching. Philip consented to baptize him, and as travellers in these circumstances would be destitute of any vessel to take up and carry

water away, they must go to it. They went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch and he baptized him. One went as far as the other ; but no mention is made that either of them went in all over, or that either of them changed his clothes. They went down both to the side or into the edge of the water, where Philip might take some in his hand and sprinkle him according to the prophecy which he had just explained to him. If we consider the circumstances of their being on their journey, there is nothing in this account but what would naturally be said, if the ordinance was administered by sprinkling. And it is unreasonable to believe that Philip, with this scripture before his eyes, would administer the ordinance without being in conformity to it.

The baptism of Lydia and her household, we are informed of Act 16. 15. This was performed by the side of a river; but they did not come here for that purpose. Lydia was here when the Lord opened her heart. Had she been converted elsewhere and come here for the purpose of baptism, the case would have been different.

In the same chapter verse 33, we are informed of the baptism of the jailor and his family. "And he took them the same hour of the night and washed their stripes, and was baptized, *he* and all his straightway." Paul and Silas had been taken, scourged and

put into the inner prison. At midnight there was an earthquake, the jailor was frightened, he collected his family, Paul instructed them, the jailor was converted, he washed the apostle's stripes and was baptized he and all his. Now the collection of the jailor's family, Paul's instruction, the jailor's washing their stripes and the baptism of himself and his family appears to have been done in the space of one hour, in the *outer* prison. He brought them out from where they were, which was the *inner* prison. After this business was accomplished, he brought them into his house, that is, into his own apartment. The whole appears to be under one roof.

Is there any thing in this account that looks as if they went away to a river or pond for immersion? Certainly no. Every circumstance forbids such an idea. Had it been necessary to go abroad for baptism, it would probably, even under common circumstances, have been delayed until morning. And this case was attended with special reasons for delay, if it was necessary to go abroad. Paul and Silas were prisoners; and had the jailor gone out with them, it would have subjected him to a severe penalty. His orders were very strict; and how much he feared the punishment, if the least blame fell on him, we are informed verse 27. Neither would the apostles encourage him to

get into this difficulty. The apostles too, were put into prison contrary to law, and were determined to have recompence. When the magistrates discovered their error, they sent the sergeants to tell them they might go. All they wanted now was to get them once over the fills of the prison doors. Paul knew too much for this, and would not stir one step out of prison, until he had received a recompence. It is then evident that this whole family was baptized suddenly in the dead of the night and in the outer prison.

Whoever reads the New Testament with any degree of attention, will perceive at once, that vast multitudes were baptized by John, by the disciples of Christ, while he was with them, and by his apostles after his resurrection. If immersion had been the mode of baptism, it must have been a work of labour and inconvenience to baptize such multitudes. Sometimes they must have gone a great way for water. Now contrary to this, it is every where represented, as being performed at any time, with convenience and ease, but no where as a work of labour or inconvenience. No mention is made of any one's changing clothes, of having wet clothes on, of changing after baptism, of going away for baptism, nor of one circumstance, necessarily connected with immersion.

In other matters such circumstances are

mentioned. When the blind man came to Jesus, Mark 10. 50. mention is made that he cast away his garment. When the Jews stoned Stephen, Acts 7. 58. mention is made, that they laid down their clothes at a young man's feet named Saul. When Judith washed her body all over, it is *mentioned* that she washed all over, and that she put off her *clothes*. But when THOUSANDS, AND TEN THOUSAND TIMES TEN THOUSAND, were baptized, no mention is made of any such circumstance. If immersion had been the mode, it does seem as if some of these circumstances would, at some time, have been mentioned. Something would have been said, about going away from the place of worship, of changing, or of rechanging clothes, of some instances wherein baptism, had been delayed on account of sickness, or extremity of the weather, as we find it is by those who practice immersion now. But here, all is silent. Not a single circumstance is mentioned which is necessarily, or materially connected with baptism. *immersion*

On the whole, it is very evident, that we must look for some other mode of baptism, beside immersion.

---



---

## SECTION IX.

*Sprinkling the only scriptural mode of baptism.*

AS God has appointed Baptism, to be a standing ordinance, in the church, it is reasonable to believe, that he has clearly enough, pointed out that mode, which is most acceptable to him.

The reader will now be presented, with a few arguments, to shew that sprinkling is the mode, and the *only* mode of baptism, which is scriptural. Several objections will then be offered.

I. Our first argument is from the passage, which we have already found so useful. "Saying none other things, than the prophets and Moses did say should come."

It has been shewn already that the prophets and Moses say nothing about plunging; consequently Paul preached no such mode, for he preached nothing, but what the prophets and Moses did say should come. Nothing else? Nothing truly. He declares it himself, as he had obtained help of God.

On the other hand, did the prophets or Moses, say any thing about baptism, or the

use of water any way, under the gospel dispensation? Truly they did, the matter is very clear, if we look into their writings, and take them, in connexion, with our theme. They tell us that a fountain should be opened. Zech. 13. 1. "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness." This is baptism, both of the water and of the spirit. So Ananias said unto Paul, Acts 22. 16. "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." This fountain, the prophet did say should be opened. And how was the water to be applied? By pouring on, or sprinkling. Isaiah 44. 3. "I will pour water on him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground, I will pour my spirit on thy seed, and my blessing on thine offspring." Here is mention made of pouring water and of pouring the spirit. This is the mode, which is the same as sprinkling, and the offspring are the subjects. Again 52. 15. "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations." This is a prophecy of what should come, as Paul says in our theme; because, though there were many sprinklings under the former dispensation, there was but *one* nation sprinkled. This sprinkling of *many* nations, was to take place under the gospel.

Again, Ezekiel 36. 25. "Then will I *sprinkle* clean water upon you, and ye shall be



clean." This also was a prophecy of what should come, and could not have its completion, under the former dispensation, and of course must take place and have its accomplishment under the Gospel; for though there were many sprinklings, there was no sprinkling of *clean water*. Water mixed with blood, and scarlet wool and the ashes of an heifer, and some other things was sprinkled; but no clean, unmixed or pure water. God says, "I will (in the future time) sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean." This time is stated, in the words preceding to be when God would take the church from among the heathen, and gather it from all countries. This means undeniably, the gospel day, and the sprinkling of clean water, is a gospel ordinance. The institution of this ordinance was to be for visible cleansing.

Here then, is what the prophets did say should come. God said he would open a fountain. He would sprinkle many nations. He would sprinkle clean water.

This fountain opened, is spiritually and efficaciously the blood of Christ. "The blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin." This is visibly signified by a fountain of clean water, actually applied in the ordinance of baptism, which is the only way to apply water under the gospel. This is a visible expression of the efficacy of Christ's blood, as in the pas-

sage just quoted from Acts. "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." Not that water can wash away sins, but it represents the blood of Christ which does.

The sprinkling of this clean water is God's ordinance and it shall have efficacy. He says, "I will sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean." God does this by his ministers, who act in obedience to his orders, and such as are sprinkled, God says, "shall be clean." Those sprinkled with the baptismal water, are accounted visibly clean. By this token their membership in the church is acknowledged, as was the membership of those who received the ordinance of circumcision. And those sprinkled with the blood of Christ, that is, are baptized of the spirit, are internally clean, as those who were circumcised in their hearts. Heart circumcision and heart baptism is the same thing; consequently external circumcision and external baptism is the same thing too. One baptism, or sprinkling, respects the internal, and the other the external, or visible cleanness, holiness, &c. Hence the apostle says of believer's children, in distinction from those of unbelievers, "Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." They must then have received that ordinance, which God had appointed for visible cleansing. They must have been sprinkled, with that clean water, with which God said, that

he would sprinkle his people, and they should be clean.

If then, we attend to the prophecies, which were the rule of Paul's preaching, the matter is clear, respecting both the subjects, and mode of baptism, even beyond the possibility of a doubt. The prophecies I say are clear. "I will sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean." This is what the prophets did say should come; and what the prophets did say should come, Paul says he did teach, and he says, he taught *none* other things. Here is plain truth, scripture evidence, unaided by metaphysical distinctions, and logical deductions; and it is beyond the art of sophistry to deny it. *How shall we form an argument to deny this, or how shall we get rid of the force of it?* Can we deny, that the prophets said, sprinkling of clean water should come? No, this we cannot deny. Can we deny, that the apostles did teach and practise, what the prophets did say should come? This again we cannot deny. Can we undertake to say, that any other sprinkling of clean water, is instituted in the church, except in baptism? Certainly no. Sprinkling then, is the mode of baptism. All the information, on this subject which we need, from the New Testament, is, that the apostles followed the prophecies. This we have in our theme, and elsewhere abundantly; and this argument in favour

of sprinkling, can never be set aside. It is so plain, that, with the greatest ease it may be understood. "He may run that readeth." So all the instances, wherein baptism is recorded in the New Testament, comport with the idea of sprinkling, because they were evidently performed with ease and facility. And there is not an instance, where a single circumstance is related, which is necessarily or materially connected with immersion, nor from whence it can be infered; and in a number of instances, the circumstances plainly forbid, even the possibility of immersion.

II. Under the former dispensation, purifications were performed by sprinkling. The door posts, in Egypt, when the destroying angel passed over, were sprinkled, and this consecrated the family. The altar, the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the sanctuary, were consecrated by sprinkling. That sanctuary, with its vessels, was a type of the gospel church. So the prophet speaking of the coming of Christ, and the gospel day says, (Isaiah 22. 24.) "And they shall hang upon him, all the glory of his father's house, the offspring and the issue, all vessels of small quantity, from the vessels of cups, even to the vessels of flaggons." As the vessels of the sanctuary were consecrated by sprinkling, so the prophet says that little children the offspring and the issue, even the smallest vessels,

shall be hung upon Christ, consecrated to God in the same manner, that is by sprinkling, so also the lepers, the unclean, and all the people, were consecrated to God, not by dipping, but by sprinkling. Those sprinklings were emblems of the blood of Christ. The apostle saith, Heb. 9. 19. "For when Moses had spoken every precept according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament, which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover he sprinkled likewise with blood, both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost all things under the law were purged with blood." That is with the sprinkling of blood mixed with water, &c. Blood and water, were mixed to signify, both the inward and the outward cleansing. Water could purify externally, but blood alone could purify, and cleanse the heart. "Without the shedding of blood, there could be no remission." This mixture of blood and water the apostle tells us was to be applied by sprinkling. "He sprinkled the book and all the people." He sprinkled the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry. He said, "This is the blood of the testament." The law which the apostle refers to is recorded, Numb. 19. 9. 10. 19. Hence we learn, that we must be cleansed,

both *internally* and *externally*, by sprinkling; and as the blood of Christ, is shed, for the cleansing of the heart, water *only* is now used as an outward expression of inward cleansing, by the blood of Christ. How then could God give us a stronger evidence, that sprinkling is *sufficient*, for the outward and inward cleansing of the sinner, than he has done by those plain and positive institutions? Hence the apostle argues, not from plunging to sprinkling, but from sprinkling to plunging. He says "Our hearts are sprinkled." "We are come to the blood of sprinkling." The dispensation is changed, but it is a dispensation of sprinkling still, not of *mixed* but of *clean* water. This is a better sacrifice than mixed water, as it gives a more clear and distinct idea of the nature of divine purity, and sanctification.

III. The external, visible seal of God's covenant, the ordinance that admits into the visible church, is expressive of what is done to the heart.

Circumcision, the former seal, was appointed to shew, that in regeneration, the heart is circumcised to the Lord; cut off from sin. Hence we read so often, of the circumcision of the heart, that the heart must be circumcised to the Lord, that circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; that the outward circumcision is a sign of the circumcision of the heart, and a

seal of the righteousness of faith ; because the holy spirit doth mortify, subdue, and cut off from sin, take away wicked and carnal desires, and implant those that are pure and holy. So baptism, the latter seal of the same covenant, is appointed to shew, that in regeneration, the heart is baptized to the Lord, that is, cleansed from spiritual pollution, which is sin. Hence we read so often of being baptized by the Holy Ghost, of the baptism of the spirit, and of the *sprinkling* of the heart ; because the influences of the spirit, come down as the rain, fall as the dew, or as water poured, and sprinkled, and do cleanse the heart, from spiritual pollution which is sin.

Heart circumcision, and heart baptism, is undeniably the same thing. Consequently external circumcision and external baptism is the same thing too. Each ordinance is designed to express, what is done to the heart. Therefore baptism is a token of the same covenant as circumcision, and equally a seal of the righteousness of the same faith.

This idea of the analogy, between the outward and inward baptism, is further expressed, by the following scriptures, which speak of these baptisms, under different names, but parallel to each other. John 3. 5. " Except a man be born of the water, and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." One is the outward

and the other the inward baptism. 2 Cor. 1. 22. "Who hath sealed us, and given us the earnest of the spirit, in our hearts." Outward baptism is here the seal and the earnest of the spirit in the heart is regeneration. Titus 3. 5. "He saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." Here again is the outward and the inward baptism. Water-baptism is called the washing of regeneration, which is the sign of the regeneration of the heart, as circumcision is said to be the sign of the circumcision of the heart. But the renewing of the Holy Ghost is regeneration itself. Heb. 10. 22. "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." The sprinkling of the heart is heart baptism, regeneration, and the washing of the body, the outward baptism, which expresses what is done to the heart. It is easily seen, from these scriptures, and from what has been said before, that the outward and the inward baptisms are analogous. Though there may be verbal variations respecting them, yet in sense they are perfectly adapted to each other. The outward is designed to express the inward.

We have before shewn that washing and springling are the same thing, and when a part of the body is washed it is said to be clean every whit, all over. This washing the body, and which expresses what is done



to the heart, is the fulfilling the prophecy, "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean." - As the heart is baptized, or washed by sprinkling, so the body must be baptized or washed by sprinkling *too*. If the *inward* baptism is by sprinkling, the *outward* baptism *must* be by sprinkling too, or else it does not bear a resemblance to the inward, and expresses what is done to the heart.

Again, the inward baptism is often expressed by the application of Christ's blood to the heart, by which we have forgiveness of sins. Outward baptism being the visible sign of the application of Christ's blood to the heart, is sometimes spoken of as containing the same grace as the blood itself; only because it is the sign of that blood, and of the benefits pertaining to it. 1 John 1. 7. "And the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth from all sin." Acts 2. 38. "Be baptized for the remission of sins." 22. 16. "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." That is, Arise and receive that ordinance which represents a work of grace on the heart and the forgiveness of sins, by the application of Christ's blood.

Again: that the water and the blood, the outward and the inward baptisms, are parallel with each other was expressed, when from the pierced side of the blessed Jesus "forthwith came there out blood and water."

1 John 5. 6. " This is he that came by water and by blood, even Jesus Christ, not by water only, but by water and by blood, and it is the spirit which beareth witness, because the spirit is truth." Here again is the water and the blood, one outward and the other inward. St. John proceeds, " For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, the water and the blood, and these three agree in one."

The matter is here stated in the clearest manner possible. So true as there are three, that bear record in heaven, and these three are *one*, so true also, there are three, that bear witness in earth, and these three do actually agree in one. Two of these viz. the spirit and the blood, are inward on the heart, but the water is outward on the body.

The spirit is the agent, the water is the visible sign, the blood is the blood of the covenant, which Jesus shed on the cross, and is the price of all our mercies. These three, viz. the spirit, the water, and the blood, agree in *one*. God hath joined them together, and no man may put them asunder. The application of water, outwardly, represents the application of blood inwardly.

By these three, we are sanctified, we are washed, we are cleansed.

1st. By the spirit. Rom. 15. 16. "Being sanctified by the Holy Ghost." 1 Cor. 6. 11. "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified by the spirit of our God."

2d. By the water, Eph. 5. 26. "That he might sanctify, and cleanse it, (the church) with the washing of water, by the word."

3d. By the blood. Heb. 13. 12. "wherefore Jesus also that he might sanctify the people, with his own blood." These are Christ's witnesses in earth,

The spirit is one,

The water is one,

The blood is one.

And these three, agree in one.

Two are inward, and one is outward. But what is the mode of application? Is it plunging, or is it sprinkling?

Now if we certainly know how any two, or even how any one of them is applied, we know, as certain, how all are applied, for they all agree in one.

How then is the *spirit* applied? By pouring which is the same as sprinkling. Prov. 1. 23. "I will pour out my spirit unto you." Isaiah 44. 3. "I will pour my spirit on thy seed." Zech. 12. 10. "I will *pour* upon the house of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of grace and supplication." It is compared to the coming down of the rain and the falling of the dew. Isaiah 5. 6. "I will command the clouds that they rain

no rain upon it." He is speaking of the spiritual vineyard the church, and the rain is spiritual rain, the influences of the spirit. Hosea 10. 12. "Till he come, and rain righteousness upon you." 14. 5. "I will be as the dew to Israel." These passages plainly speak of the coming down, of the spirit, as the rain, and as the dew; and by these the heart is *baptized*, the heart is *sprinkled*. That operation of the spirit, by which we are said to be washed, cleansed, and baptized, is by sprinkling, or pouring. And how is the blood applied? This also is by sprinkling. We are washed with this blood, by sprinkling. Heb. 12. 24. "Ye are come to the blood of sprinkling." 1 Pet. 1. 2. "Unto sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."

The spirit then is applied by sprinkling, the blood is applied by sprinkling, and by these two the heart is "*Sprinkled*, from an evil conscience," i. e. regenerated. It is then certain, that the water *must* be applied by sprinkling, as by the prophet, God said, "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean."

This argument as well as the others, is familiar, plain, and easy to be understood, and is supported by the word of God in the clearest and most positive manner. How then shall we deny it. Can we say that the outward ordinance is not designed to represent that which is done to the heart, or that the

water does not agree in one, with the spirit and the blood? No. Can we say that the spirit and the blood are not sprinkled? No. Can we say that any other mode of applying water, beside sprinkling, will agree with the spirit, and the blood, and express what is done to the heart? Surely no. If then the water is not sprinkled, there is no agreement between these witnesses, but a manifest incongruity or unsuitableness of things one to the other.

The water is a visible sign of inward or invisible grace, and so much only as is sufficient for a *sign* to represent the thing signified, is suitable for the ordinance. Plunging is then improper, unscriptural and very wrong. Nothing can be more unnatural than *plunging* to represent the influences of the Spirit, or the sprinkling of the blood of Christ on the heart. In other words, plunging cannot represent or be a sign of sprinkling.

Now the express declaration of God by the prophet, that the time should come, when he would sprinkle clean water upon his people, the express declaration of the apostle, that he taught *none* other things than what the prophets did say should come, the universal practice of purification by sprinkling under the former dispensation, the general current of scripture, that the external must correspond with and express that which is internal, that the water must agree in one

with the spirit and the blood, afford the most clear, decided and unequivocal evidence, that sprinkling of clean water is the only scriptural mode of baptism and was the invariable practice of the apostles.

Again: the operation of the spirit on our hearts, by which the heart is baptized, "sprinkled from an evil conscience," is called a seal. Eph. 4. 30. "Grieve not the holy Spirit, whereby ye were sealed." 2 Cor. 1. 22. "Who hath sealed us and given us the earnest of the spirit, in our hearts." Regeneration is the internal seal of God's covenant. Circumcision did once represent this, was a visible token of the covenant and seal of the righteousness of faith. But under the gospel, water agrees in ONE with the Spirit. Therefore water is a token of the same covenant and seal of the righteousness of the same faith.

A seal is the ratification or confirmation of covenant promises, engagements and obligations. God's covenant has two seals, one is internal, and the other external. The spirit seals the heart, water seals the body. The latter agrees to the former. The spirit, the water, and the blood agree in one. On God's part, he seals his own faithfulness, to the promises contained in the covenant of grace, on condition of our believing in Christ. On our part we seal our obligation, to love God, to obey his will, and believe on his son Je-

fus Christ. It is then as certain, that the water is an external seal, as that the spirit is an internal.

We read again, Rev. 7. 3. that the servants, or people of God are sealed not *all over*; but in their *foreheads*. That chapter contains a prophecy of the state of the church, at a certain period. We are informed in the first place, that a restraint was laid upon the winds, i. e. the winds of doctrine, particularly of false doctrine, and error. This restraint was to continue, until there should be a revival of religion, and the church prepared for the shock, when these winds should be let loose. This revival of religion is expressed, by administering the external seal of the covenant. The heart is sealed by the sprinkling of the *Spirit*, but the body by the sprinkling of water in the *face*. And because the gentiles by faith are brought into the covenant made with Abraham, and partake of the root and fatness of that olive tree, so those who are brought in and sealed from among the gentiles, are spoken of, as belonging to the tribes of Israel. To each tribe an equal number.

Again; "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." This passage Mr. Merrill quotes page 40, and then adds, "Both sides grant, that baptism, or to be born of water, is the only way of admittance into

this kingdom." Both sides then agree, that to be born of the water, is to be baptized. But to be born of the spirit, is to have the heart sprinkled of the spirit, and accordingly, to be born of the water, is to be sprinkled with the water.

Page 41. "It (baptism) appears to be, for a representation of our being washed in the blood of the lamb." Very well, but we are washed in the blood of the lamb by sprinkling; and nothing can be more unseemly than plunging, to represent the sprinkling of the blood of the lamb.

Page 43. "The purport, end, and design of the ordinance appears to be, to point out or shadow forth the forgiveness, or remission of sins, and the being cleansed from them." This is all true, and it is a matter of infinite rejoicing, that we do not disagree about the purport, end and design of the ordinance. But this is also true, that we receive remission of sins, not by being plunged, but by being sprinkled with the spirit, and with the blood of Christ.

From what has been said we learn how important a thing baptism is. There are three, that bear witness for Christ in earth, and baptism is one. In this view, let us consider the following scriptures again. John 3. 5. Except a man (any one) be born of water, and of the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." We have before shewn that God required both ex-



ternal, and also heart circumcision, for visible standing, in his covenant, or church. Of adults faith was required first, but infants must receive the seal of their parent's faith, and of such infants, actual faith was required, as soon as they were capable of exercising it. Our saviour here puts being born of the water, only parallel with external circumcision, and being born of the spirit, the same as being circumcised in the heart. He makes the terms for membership, in the church, the same as they had ever been before. Consequently he attaches to baptism, all the importance that had ever been attached to circumcision. Tit. 3. 5. "He saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Eph. 5. 26. "That he might sanctify, and cleanse it (the church) with the washing of water, by the word." Acts 2. 38. "Be baptized, for the remission of sins." 22. 16. "Be baptized, and wash away thy sins."

Some people set light by baptism, especially for children. But in these passages, and others, baptism stands immediately connected with, and doth represent regeneration, remission of sins by the blood of Christ, and salvation. In this light it was considered by primitive Christians. Origen who lived and wrote about one hundred years after the apostles, has these expressions, as we are informed. "The church had from the apostles an order to baptize children."

“ Infants are baptized for the remission of sins.” Cyprian one hundred and fifty years after the apostles, speaking of baptism calls it, “ The sacrament of salvation.” Pelagius, about one hundred and fifty years after Cyprian, calls it, the common redemption of mankind, and says, “ Who can deny to an infant of whatever age, the common redemption of mankind.” About this time sprang up the denial of original sin. This error was confuted, by an argument, from the baptism of infants. It was this. If infants must be baptized, for the remission of sins, as the apostles had commanded, then they had sin ; but if they had no sin they needed no baptism. This argument was conclusive to settle the matter about original sin. Such were the impressions of the nature, and importance of baptism, which the apostles left on the minds of their followers, and such is the evidence from the history of the church, concerning the early practice of infant baptism.

Mr. Merrill says, page 58. “ It was an early error in the church, that baptism was necessary to salvation.” This he says, after quoting, the above mentioned passage, from Cyprian. But have these fathers, and others, said more than is said in the scriptures ? When we find baptism, immediately connected with regeneration, remission of sins, the blood of Christ, and salvation, we must

suppose there is a *sense* in which it is necessary. Not that we are to suppose, God has bound himself, to save all who are baptized; neither are we to suppose, he will save none else. He is still left to his own pleasure, for he is a sovereign God. Nor is baptism necessary as the agent; this is the spirit of God. Nor is it necessary, as the meritorious cause; this is the blood of Christ. But it may be and is necessary, as the visible sign, to agree in one, with the spirit, and with the blood. And God may connect salvation with baptism, as much as Naaman's cure from the leprosy was connected with his washing in Jordan. 2. Kings 5. 10.

There is no instance, wherein the Scriptures, do so closely connect salvation with prayer, nor with any other duty, nor with any means we can use, as with baptism. Yet it is presumption to neglect prayer, and greater presumption to neglect the baptism of a child, where it can be regularly done. The servants of Naaman "came near and said, My father, if the prophet had bid thee do some great thing, wouldest thou not have done it. How much more when he saith unto thee, Wash and be clean. Small matters are oftentimes despised because they are small, though God connects them, with things, which are vastly important.

Mr. Merrill, as we observed just now, cites the words of Christ, "Except a man

be born of water, and of the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." And then adds, "Both sides grant that baptism, or to be born of water, is the *only* way of admittance into this kingdom (the visible church)." Very good. But Jesus says again, "Suffer the little children and forbid them not to come unto me for of such is the kingdom of God." It is then certain that Jesus Christ has appointed that little children shall enter this kingdom, which he says none can enter, except they be born of the water. The plain, and undeniable inference is, that Jesus Christ, did appoint baptism for little children.

Doubtless we may say, as did the ancient fathers, in ages following the apostles. *The church had an order from the apostles to baptize little children, because the apostles received it from Christ. Little children must be baptized for the remission of sins. It is the sign of the common redemption of mankind, and must not be denied to infants of whatever age.*

There is indeed such a connexion, between the water, and the blood, that it seems, none can set light by the water, and yet place a proper estimate, on the blood. Christ has joined them together, in parallel streams they flowed from his wounded side, and no man may put them asunder.

We may further see the straits, and difficulties to which the antipedo-baptists are driven. On the one hand, they are obliged

to hold that baptism is not in any sense necessary to salvation, and so, as Mr. Merrill and others do, they must blame the church in the early part of the Christian dispensation for holding that it was. For if baptism is in any sense necessary to salvation, then the antipedo-baptists are cruel indeed, to let their infant children die unbaptized. But on the other hand, if in no sense necessary to salvation, why did Christ institute it? And why do they make it a breaking point with their brethren, and excommunicate the whole church of God of all other denominations, for that which they themselves say, is in no sense necessary to salvation?

Further; it is not only necessary, that baptism be administered, but that it be administered in the scriptural mode, which we see is sprinkling, and *only* sprinkling. Plunging is unscriptural intirely. It makes the witnesses of Christ on earth, quite to differ, and disagree. It cannot represent the sprinkling of Christ's blood. Neither can it represent a seal, for nobody ever had an idea of sealing a thing all over.

I used formerly, to think the mode of baptism was quite immaterial, and so did many of my brethren, much better than myself. But for myself now, I confess, there are very strong, and serious objections, against administering baptism, in any other mode, than by sprinkling, or pouring.

These, I am willing to make known in a cool and candid manner, and if those who differ from me, have better arguments and clearer evidence, to satisfy their consciences, and justify their mode, than I have for mine, I will not blame them, though they differ from me.

Obj. 1. Immersion is generally quite inconvenient, many times unsafe, and sometimes impossible. It is inconvenient for a congregation to leave the house of God, and go away to a river or pond, at the distance of half a mile, or a mile, as is often the case, for the purpose of baptism. On this account, many aged people cannot attend. It is also inconvenient for the minister <sup>and converts</sup> to change, and rechange their clothes. These are inconveniences which happen, at all seasons of the year. But in the winter season, baptism by immersion, is always unsafe, and in some instances, has been attended with quite unhappy consequences.

There are also frequent instances wherein immersion is utterly impossible, with any degree of safety, as when persons on beds of sickness and near the close of life, hopefully experience and have a desire to profess religion, receive baptism and the Lord's supper. Such instances do occur, but in such cases the dipping baptists dare not proceed. Therefore these persons must linger out their lives and die, and go into the eternal world,

without having an opportunity to satisfy their consciences here. But as we hear of none of these inconveniencies from the scripture : as nothing is said about going from the place of worship, of the want of water, of changing clothes, of delaying baptism for sickness, and as the apostles could administer baptism on all occasions ; whether by day, or by night, in summer, or in winter ; and as they baptized so many multitudes, and with such facility, as to baptize three thousand in an afternoon, and as we never hear of an instance, that any sick person was required to delay baptism, we may know that the apostles never encountered these difficulties, and it is very unreasonable that we should.

Obj. 2. Immersion cannot be performed, with the same solemnity as sprinkling : and sometimes is quite ridiculous. God hath said, “ In all places where I record my name I will come unto thee and bless thee.” In the house of God, is the most proper place to perform religious duties, and administer sacred and solemn ordinances. But the place where, is not so much as the manner how. The apostle says, “ Let all things be done decently and in order.” But baptism by dipping cannot be done decently. The great and good Mr. Baxter in his “ Plain scripture proofs of infant’s church membership and baptism,” says “ It is a breach of the seventh

commandment, Thou shalt not commit adultery, which forbids all incitements to uncleanness and all immodest actions ; but to baptize (i. e. dip) women naked or next to naked, is an immodest action, and an excitement to uncleanness ; therefore it is forbidden." To see in the midst of a gazing multitude confusedly pressed together, a Christian minister, or elder, stripping off his coat, to see the persons to be baptized, in a different dress from what they had on just now, looks more (said a bystander, on such an occasion) like acting a comedy, than attending a solemn ordinance.

It is oftentimes with difficulty, that serious people can refrain from smiles ; and the more thoughtless often break into open laughter. To prevent this, the officiating Elder usually makes an address to the people, and tells them the ordinance is very solemn, even as solemn as death. He tells them, if so many of their companions were now, actually dead, and the funeral solemnities to be performed, it would not be more solemn. He will say further, " I intreat you to be sober, and to take care that you don't laugh."

Now if six, or eight persons were actually dead, and the funeral to be attended, it would seem quite ridiculous, to hear the officiating minister, tell the people, " This is a solemn occasion, your friends are dead and



“ must be buried and do you take care that “ you do not laugh.” On such occasions, we have no need to charge people not to laugh ; nor when baptism is administered by sprinkling. If then plunging is in its nature very solemn, why this charge ? The fact is, there is a manifest incongruity, between the solemnity of the ordinance, and immersion as the mode, and this is a serious objection against this mode.

Further : it seems strange, that people should be so carried away with this mode, as to encounter all the difficulties, mentioned under the former objection, that they should go so far, as totally to deprive some of the ordinance, only because they are sick, that they should encounter the good sense of a great majority of the Christian church, and what is vastly more, that they should encounter the plain scripture evidence in favour of sprinkling. Why is this ? Elder Snow\* has told us why. In an address to his brethren, and sermon on the subject of open communion he says, “ It (immersion) is the beaten path of tradition.” Again ; “ I believe we may idolize baptism as well as silver and gold by placing it in the room of redeeming blood, which possibly some have done.” If then baptism by immersion is the

\* After being a dipping baptist about twenty years, he was convinced that sprinkling was baptism, and thought it his duty to commune with other denominations.

beaten path of tradition, if it be idolatry if it be placed in the room of redeeming blood, as Elder Snow says ; no wonder at what they do ; no wonder they refuse communion, with all other denominations, on account of their baptism.

In his address to his brethren, Elder Snow says, “ As to my connexion with you as a member, I am not disposed to be held as a prisoner, when I trust, I have been made free, by my Jesus.”

For a dipping baptist, to be held to close communion, after he has been enlightened, and spiritually led, into the nature of Christian charity, is a state of imprisonment, and when Jesus makes any truly free, he delivers them from those slavish notions, of close communion. It was a happy freedom, that Elder Snow had gained. O, that Jesus would make them all free, and suffer them no longer to idolize *immersion*, nor follow the beaten path of tradition.

Obj. 3. The most weighty objection is, that immersion is unscriptural. If it was scriptural, and could be proved so to be, we might say no more. It would be our duty, with all cheerfulness, to submit to every inconvenience. But we have seen that those scriptures, which are thought by some, to favour immersion, afford no conclusive evidence, and the accounts of baptisms, in the New-Testament, are destitute of those cir-

cumstances, which are necessary to render immersion in any degree credible. But those scriptures, which speak of sprinkling, are plain and positive. Sprinkling is what the prophets did say should come, and what the prophets did say should come, Paul says he did preach, and he preached none other things. God has shewn us, by many institutions, that sprinkling is sufficient, to sanctify to the purifying of the flesh, or for visible cleansing. And sprinkling *only*, will express what is done to the heart, and agree in one, with the spirit, and with the blood.

Obj. 4. Another objection nearly connected with the one last mentioned is, that it is reproaching God to go beyond his institutions, as much as it is to come short of them. We have no more right to add than we have to diminish. Mr. Merrill page 53 says, "No man, nor body of men hath any more right, to add to, or diminish from this ordinance, than they have to institute a new one, and call it Christ's." Again; "Whenever, and wherever the ordinance of baptism, is so changed, as to loose the intent of the institution, then and there, the ordinance is lost, and becomes no Christian ordinance at all."

Mr. Merrill said this, when he supposed he had proved immersion; but sprinkling we see is the only mode which is scriptural, and which can express the intent of the in-

stitution, which is to show what is done to the heart, by the spirit and by the blood of Christ. Let him then look for the beam in his own eyes.

Immersion seems to suppose, the nature of cleansing, is in the efficacy of the water, rather than in the efficacy of divine grace, as though it was something which man could do, aside from God ; and if so the more water the better. But it is not the efficacy of the water, but the efficacy of divine grace. It is the blood of Christ, applied by the holy spirit.

The water comes from a fountain, so does the grace of God. The former represents the latter. God says, " I will sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean." Sprinkling is God's ordinance, he does it by his ministers, and if God does it, one drop is as good as the ocean, and much better, because God says, by this ye shall be clean.

To esteem sprinkling insufficient, when God says it is sufficient, (to say the least) argues a great distrust in God, and want of faith in Jesus Christ ; and what is more, a great degree of selfrighteousness ; but human nature is prone to err and go to excess ; and though our brethren excommunicate us we must not excommunicate them ; because doubtless many of them may be sincere.

When Jesus poured water into a basin, and washed his disciples feet, and told them, without such washing, they had no interest

in him, Peter saith, Not my feet only but my hands and my head. Peter would have been plunged in a minute, had it been convenient, and had not Jesus restrained him, and no wonder if many not so good as Peter, should go astray.

Human nature it seems hath devised this mode of baptism, and many years practice hath made it the beaten path of tradition; but from the beginning it was not so.

---

## SECTION X.

*Harmony of the scriptures. Wisdom of God in settling matters of faith and practice. Difference between the two dispensations.*

WE have clearly seen, that the scriptures, of the Old-Testament, were the rule of apostolic preaching; and not one of all Paul's enemies could deny it. Sundry important considerations will now follow.

1. We see the harmony of the scriptures of both Testaments. About two hundred and fifty passages are quoted expressly, from the Old-Testament, to establish doctrines in

the New, and many of them three and four times each, in different places, and in many instances, whole discourses are founded, on a particular text. And besides quotations, the expressions generally, and the sentiments always, in the New Testament, are similar to those in the Old. To illustrate this idea, we will compare a few sentences, of our Saviour's sermon on the mount, with correspondent passages, in the Old-Testament.

Matt. 5. 3. "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." Psalm 34. 6. 132. 15. "This poor man cried, and the Lord heard him." "I will satisfy her poor with bread."

Verse 4th, "Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted." Isaiah 61. 2. 3. "To comfort all that mourn. To appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give them beauty for ashes, the oil of Joy for mourning, and the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness."

Verse 5th, "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." Psalm 22. 26. 37. 11. "The meek shall eat and be satisfied." "The meek shall inherit the earth."

Verse 6th, "Blessed are they which do hunger, and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled." Psalm 107. 9. "For he satisfieth the hungry soul, with goodness."

Verse 7th, "Blessed are the merciful for

they shall obtain mercy." 2 Sam. 22. 26.  
 "With the merciful thou wilt show thyself merciful."

Verse 8th, "Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God." Psalm. 24. 3. 4.  
 "Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord, and who shall stand in the holy place? He that hath clean hands and a pure heart." In these sentences our Saviour does not make express quotations, but the sentiment is the same, and the words almost the same, and this is the case with a great part of the New-Testament. A considerable part more is only a recital of the general sense of parts of the Old, as Stephen's and Paul's discourses, Acts 7th and 13th chapters are striking instances.

2. We discover also the wisdom of God, in settling all matters respecting the covenant standing, faith and practice of the church, under the gospel, long before the coming of Christ in his human nature.

The personal appearing of the Son of God in the flesh, to make an atonement for sin, was the greatest event that ever took place, in this our world. Ages had been employed in making preparation for it. The visible church, by express order of God, had been formed in the family of Abraham. The covenant was everlasting. Christ's blood was the blood of the everlasting covenant. In this respect all was settled. A

system of doctrines was also settled, and all the changes which should take place after the coming of Christ, were revealed by the prophets, as we have seen. Otherwise the difficulties, through the prejudices of men's hearts, must have been insuperably great. The same faith was preached after, as before the coming of Christ. When St. Paul had quoted a passage from the writings of Moses, he says, "This is the word of faith, which we preach."

3. Our subject shews us wherein consisted all the difference between the two dispensations. In the *first* place there was a removal of all the types and shadows. This service, for the time being, was burdensome, tho' vastly beneficial. Types were appointed as a guide to the believer's faith, to direct his views immediately to the Son of God. Some of these were designed to represent Christ's character and office, as the high-priest. Others, the nature of his death and the shedding of his blood, as the offering of slain beasts. Others, the efficacy of his power, as the brazen serpent. Others, the purifying influences of his Spirit, as the various washings or sprinklings. But after Christ suffered these were removed, being no more needed. Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the one a token of admission into the visible church, and the other a remem-



brance of Christ's death, answer all the purposes of circumcision and the passover.\*

Some pretend, (though without any foundation) that removing the types did wholly dissolve the church, if it ever was a church, and of course an intire new church was erected. This reasoning is as strange, as erroneous. For instance; the brazen serpent, was as conspicuous a type of Christ, as any other. Looking upon this the people were to worship God. This, as much as a sacrifice, was a mode of worship, designed to bring Christ to their senses. But did the appointment, or removal, of this mode of worship, in the least alter the covenant standing of the church? Or change the qualifications of its members? You will say no. Neither could the appointment, nor the removal of all the types. This Paul establishes, Gal. 3. 17. "Now this I say that the covenant which was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." The law of ceremonies, types and shadows could not, in its appointment nor in its removal, disannul that covenant, which went before, and which was "confirmed of God in Christ."

The unbelieving Jews were broken off,

\* See Bishop Porteus on the Passover and Supper. Lecture xxi.

Rom. 11. 20: *not* because the types were removed, and modes of worship changed, but because they were unbelievers. Such as believed, continued in their standing. God did not cast away his people whom he foreknew, and believing gentiles were grafted into the same covenant.

Secondly ; a great increase of light, under the latter dispensation, is another difference. The real sufferings, death, and resurrection of Christ, exhibit the nature of the atonement, and bring pardon, peace, and justification, down to our very senses, in a more conspicuous manner, than what could be, by any types whatever, though designed, to give the best view of Christ, which the nature of the case could admit. In comparison of the latter the apostle the former, "weak and beggarly elements, shadows of good things to come, but the body is of Christ."

All the material difference then, between the two dispensations consists in these two things, first a removal of the types, and secondly an increase of light, from the actual life, sufferings, death and resurrection of Christ.

## SECTION XI.

*Necessity of studying the Old Testament.*

**H**AVING in the progress of our subject, seen, that the scriptures, of the New Testament are founded wholly on those of the Old, we learn the necessity of studying the Old, that we may understand the New. A man may read the New Testament, all his days, and if he neglects the Old, he will be in respect of religious and divine knowledge, but a babe in Christ; because, many passages of the New Testament, would be intirely obscure, except we see their connexion, with the Old Testament. When a text is quoted from the Old, to establish any thing in the New, it is necessary, to see what it stands connected with, in the Old Testament, for this may, very materially alter the sense. Hence we find those frequent exhortations from Christ, and the apostles to search the scriptures, to increase in knowledge, to abound in knowledge, &c.

The Bereans are highly commended (Acts 17. 11.) because when they heard Paul preach,

they searched the scriptures, (of the Old Testament) daily, to see whether those things which he preached were so, and they had the satisfaction to find, that all his preaching was in conformity to them.

There are many people, who believe in the scriptures of the Old Testament, as much as in those of the New ; but very erroneously suppose, that the New Testament contains all that is necessary, and of course they neglect the Old. The unavoidable consequence is, they are very ignorant of divine knowledge. This is a great error. Incalculable mischiefs have come from it. People who read only the New Testament, not only deprive themselves of the precious knowledge contained in the Old, but can never have a good understanding of the New ; and are constantly exposed to the artful designs of wicked men, whose interest and ambition is to propagate falsehood and error. Against these wiles, people never can defend themselves, while they are ignorant of the Old Testament scriptures.

The error of many of the Jews, in the days of our Saviour was, they did not attend to these scriptures. For this he blames them exceedingly, and says, " Ye do always err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God." Their ignorance was the foundation of their error. They went about to establish a righteousness of their

own. Christ commands them, saying, "Search the scriptures" and he commands us, as much as he did them, and our neglect will be as criminal as theirs.

Ministers in a special manner, must be much in the study of these scriptures; or else they will never be furnished to declare, "the whole counsel of God." We have before noticed, and with propriety may repeat it, that after Christ's resurrection from the dead, when his disciples were no more to have his personal presence and instruction, when they were about to enter on the arduous task of the ministry, and preach the Gospel, of the grace of God to their fellow sinners, "Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures." Luke 24. 45. Paul's method of preaching was this, "He reasoned with them out of the scriptures." Acts 17. 2. It was a high commendation of Apollos, that he was "mighty in the scriptures." Acts 18. 24. And of Timothy, that "from a child he had known the holy scriptures." Without the knowledge of these scriptures, ministers are but blind leaders of the blind. What then shall we think of those ministers who tell their people that it is a matter of no importance, whether the Old Testament scriptures are read or whether they are not read? The New Testament contains all that is necessary for us!

## SECTION XII.

*Wickedness and danger of denying the Old Testament.*

5. WE learn how wicked, and dangerous it is, to deny the scriptures of the Old Testament, as some do, who profess to believe in, and hold to those of the New. They suppose a distinction, between the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, contrary to the scriptures themselves, viz, that the New Testament sets up a new religion, and a new church, which was unknown in the Old Testament, and of course they say the Old Testament scriptures are of no authority now. The covenant which God made with Abraham, and his seed, when he first instituted a church, in his family, notwithstanding all the New Testament references to it, they affect to despise, and endeavour to twist, and turn it into every shape and sense, but the *true* sense. Formerly they said, it was a covenant of works, then a national covenant and church, then a typical, then a temporal covenant, and a

mere civil institution, intirely destitute of religion.

Doctor Gill an eminent antipedo-baptist writer says, " It seems rather, to be a covenant of works than of grace." After making some further remarks he says again, " All which, favour nothing of a covenant of grace, a covenant by which we can have a grounded hope of salvation, but the contrary." How strange ! Contrary to salvation ! What is it then but a covenant of damnation ? Reader, pause, nay go back and take a candid view, of the five first sections of this treatise, then look again, look and be astonished, at the sentiments of Doctor Gill !! Hast thou done it ? Prepare thyself then to go forward, for as God said to the prophet Ezekiel " Turn thee yet again and thou shalt see greater abominations that they do." Thou shalt see them, undervalue things, which are sacred, run down God's most holy institutions, and forbid the use of the Old Testament scriptures.

Abraham Booth, a writer of high reputation, in the same denomination, in his " Essays\* on the kingdom of Christ," has made a formidable attack, on the scriptures of the Old Testament, and upon God's institutions, under the former dispensation. He represents the church of God, the vine which his

\* New Haven edition.

own right hand had planted, as a political institution, a national covenant, a temporal covenant, a political kingdom, a kingdom of this world, a kingdom, in opposition to the kingdom of Christ, &c. A few of his expressions, we will now consider.

Page 32. "To be an obedient subject of their civil government, and a compleat member of their ecclesiastical state, were manifestly the same thing." "Under that economy, Jehovah acknowledged all those, for *his people*, and himself, as *their God*, who performed an external obedience to his commands, even though in their hearts disaffected to him."

Now the highest promise, which God ever made to men, is that he will be their God, and that they shall be his people. This, it is said, God promised, under the former dispensation, to men, "when in their hearts, they were disaffected to him." That such a doctrine cannot be true we have already seen.

Page 39. "Health, long life, riches, honours, and victory over their enemies, were promised, by Jehovah to their external obedience."

Page 50. "That national institution being abolished, Jehovah's political sovereignty is at an end." Mr. Booth's representation is, that the church, under the former dispensation, was only a civil government, a political sovereignty; and obedience, to this civil gov-



ernment, was all that God required. On this ground, his people enjoyed his richest favours. Whether by such representations as these, Mr. Booth is propagating truth, and doing honour to Jehovah, any reader can judge.

Page 104. "To reason from the constitution, the laws and government, the privileges and rites of the Jewish, to those of the christian church; is to adopt a *capital* principle of Papal depravity and grossly to corrupt our holy religion." How strange! Was any deluded enthusiast, ever more infatuated? If we reason from God's most holy institutions, as they are recorded in the Old Testament, it is "to adopt a capital principle of papal depravity, and grossly to corrupt our holy religion." This truly is one way, to get rid of the Old Testament! But how often Saint Paul reasons, in this papally depraved manner, (as Mr. Booth calls it) we have seen before. He reasons much from the covenant standing of the Jews, and from the covenant promises; which covenant was the constitution of the church. He appeals to the doctrine of Moses, and says "This is the word of faith, which we preach." He reasons, from the passover, from the baptism of the Israelites at the red sea, from the sprinkling of the blood of the covenant, from the precept which forbid to muzzle the mouth of the ox, and from the

law for the support of the priests. 1 Cor. 9. 8. "Say I these things as a man? Or saith the law the same also? For it is written in the law, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox, that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen? or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written." The apostle here, appeals to the law, in its most general, and unqualified sense, and reasons from it. "Say I these things as a man, or saith the law the same also?" This is not the moral law, but the law to regulate the usages of the church, both under the former, and also the latter dispensation. Verse 13. "Do ye not know, that they which minister about holy things, live of the things of the temple? And they which wait at the altar; are partakers at the altar?" Rom. 15. 4. "Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our *learning*." Paul here speaks in the most indefinite and unlimited manner. "Whatsoever things," &c.

St. Paul himself reasoned either from the constitution and government of the church in general terms, or from particular precepts, usages, customs, &c. as occasion did require. But did he adopt a capital principle of papal depravity, and grossly corrupt our holy religion? According to Mr. Booth he did. But this again will make God's own institutions, the very fountain of papal deprav-

ity, and gross corruption; and put God's church under the former dispensation, on a level with the papal church; and this is no worse than Mr. Booth says of those institutions, and of that church elsewhere.

Page 127. "On worship so various in its branches, and so splendid in its appearance, multitudes attended, and found amusement in it, who were in their hearts disaffected to God."

Page 130. "To save appearances, however, as many things in the Jewish ritual were *pretty well adapted* to please the carnally minded, &c." This is the distinction, which the writers of this denomination endeavour to make, between the two dispensations. The former they say, was all external, and as we have just noticed from Dr. Gill, "was not a covenant of grace, a covenant by which we can have a grounded hope of salvation, but the contrary." They represent Jehovah, as acting the part of a temporal monarch, giving laws to his people, which like the laws of men, reached only to his people's outward conduct; and as promising to grant them blessings, to own them for his people, and himself as their God (which is indeed the highest enjoyment of his saints, in earth or heaven) only on condition of external obedience, even when in their hearts they were disaffected to him. And to excite them to perform this external obedience, and make

the duties pleasant, God gave them "a worship so various in its branches, and so splendid in its appearance, that while in their hearts they were disaffected to him, they might find pleasure, and amusement" in his service. He gave them also, a ritual service "*pretty well adapted to please the carnally minded.*" On this ground Jehovah promised them "health, long life, riches, honours and victory over their enemies, and himself as their God." And if any man undertakes to reason one syllable, from God's former institutions, to find his mind and will now, he is a rank papist, or in the words of Mr. Booth, has adopted a capital principle of papal depravity, and grossly corrupted our holy religion. Such representations are pretty well adapted to please the carnally minded sure enough! But on Mr. Booth's plan, it would be difficult, for any body to tell, how the carnally minded, should be disaffected, in their hearts, to God, when he gave them an instituted worship, which afforded such amusement, and a ritual service, pretty well adapted, to please their carnal minds, and made them such *fine offers* for attending to these amusements and carnally minded pleasures &c.!

Again: Mr. Merrill, page 73. "Shall we go to the Law, and covenant of circumcision, to prove infant baptism, when both this law and covenant, have long since waxed old, been repealed, and have perished?"

Page 81. "Christ Jesus, when personally here on earth, gave a new edition, of his own, and of his father's mind, and will." The former covenant he says, has long since been repealed, and has perished, but St. Paul says, it was confirmed of God in Christ and *cannot perish*.

A new edition is a new publication, of a book, in which, the author alters expressions, corrects mistakes, omits, adds, and makes improvements, where he finds imperfections, and error. The new edition *only* of any book, is to be considered, as being according to the author's mind or judgment, and old editions go immediately out of use. So Mr. Merrill would get the Old Testament out of use, and out of sight, like the old editions, of a book, which has since been corrected, and amended by the author. But the New Testament is not a new *edition*, it is an *addition* or supplement.

Page 83. "Ministers have no right to teach, any further, than they receive from him (Christ). When they transcribe, out of the old, into the new edition of God's word, and will, and tell us that the rite and covenant of circumcision, are to explain to us the observance of a New Testament ordinance, we are not obliged to believe them, unless they point us, to the place, where Christ hath so commanded."

This is the light in which they treat the

scriptures of the Old Testament ; and it is surprizing to see how far these sentiments have spread. Two persons not long since, as I was informed, were conversing together and one of them, naming a certain writer on infant baptism, said to the other, "Do you not think he has clearly proved a divine warrant for infant baptism." "He has indeed (said the other) but he had to go into the Old Testament for a considerable part of his proof, and that is of no authority now." So Mr. Merrill, page 61. "Are Old Testament rites to explain New Testament ordinances ? Is Moses to correct what Christ hath left incomplete ? Is it so ? Will it be wise and safe for us continually to forsake the commandments of Christ, for the precepts of men ?"

Whatever is taken from the Old Testament now, to guide our faith and direct our practice, is with them only the precepts of men. So they preach, and so multitudes believe. Mistaken men ! The apostle says, Heb. 3. 5. "Moses verily was faithful in all his (Christ's) house, as a servant." Moses, as much as Paul, was a faithful minister in Christ's church, setting things in order, according to Christ's own most holy will.

Page 79. "We ought however, to trace the history of infant baptism one step further and notice Calvin, and a multitude since, who were unwilling to acknowledge

their independence on the Mother of Harlots, for their authority in this matter, and therefore with great ingenuity have discovered infant baptism as a gospel ordinance, or the right of infants to it, in the law of Moses. Indeed they have supposed that this doctrine is implied in a number of passages of the New Testament. Yet I believe none of those who practise it are willing to venture this New Testament ordinance, upon New Testament evidence."

The two particles *un* and *in*, destroy each other. The meaning is the same as if he had said, Calvin and a multitude of others, who were willing to acknowledge their dependence on the Mother of Harlots, &c. Hence Calvin and all who baptize infants, are denounced as depending on the very Mother of Harlots, adopting her capital principles of depravity, gross corruptions, &c. And I have no doubt but the more honest part of that sect, through ignorance, prejudice and the misrepresentations of these writers, do really believe that a *capital* principle of papal depravity and gross corruption is in using the covenant of Abraham, to prove infant baptism, and in practising it, when proved.

Now we do believe that the right of infants to receive baptism can be clearly maintained by evidence from the New Testament only. But this we know that the

denial of infant baptism has not a shadow of support, except the scriptures of the Old Testament can be expunged, and this the antipedo-baptists know, as well as we do: Therefore they say, "To reason from the constitution (i. e. the covenant of Abraham) and form, the laws and government, the privileges of the Jewish, to those of the Christian church, is to adopt a capital principle of papal depravity and grossly to corrupt our holy religion.

Christ has given a new edition of his own and his father's mind and will. Ministers may not transcribe out of the old into the new edition. This is to depend on the mother of Harlots, &c.

The sabbath is treated with no more regard than other things. Elder Leland in his "Plea\* for the Baptists of Connecticut," says, page 25, "Whether the observance of the seventh day was ever enjoined on man, before Moses, whether the obligation to keep that day was moral or absolute—whether it is possible for all nations, under opposite horizons, in all the zones to keep the same day—whether the seventh day was *ever* kept as a day of worship or solely as a day of rest—whether the seventh day sabbath ceased at the resurrection of Christ and the first day succeeded in its place, are



points in which great and good men are divided. Among great and good men therefore we leave them ; for they are all distant from the point before us.”

He would persuade people that great and good men are divided in their opinion, and consequently it is uncertain when the sabbath was appointed, and how long it continued and whether it was for religious worship or not, whether the seventh day was ever a day of worship or solely for rest.

This is a singular way to get rid of the sabbath, to tell people it is a matter of doubt among great and good men, whether there ever was a sabbath ! Among great and good men, says Elder Leland, we leave it. A singular way, I say, for a public teacher, to ease the consciences of his hearers about their neglect of the sabbath ! By great and good men who are divided on this subject, he must be supposed to mean the antipedobaptists on the one side, and other denominations on the other. See Genesis 2. 2, 3. Exod. 20. 8. Levit. 19. 30. Numb. 28. 9, 10. Isaiah 58. 13, 14. Luke 4. 16, 31.

Is it not a bad cause which constrains men, to treat God's word and institutions in this manner ? And is it not as dangerous as it is wicked ? Because if the Old Testament fails the New must fail with it, for it is founded upon it.

We now come to that part of the subject

which is the most difficult, either for the *writer* or the *reader*, and that is to make such reflections as may be pertinent, and such as the importance of the subject requires, and at the same time maintain that candor and charity which is essential to the Christian religion. But the enquiry comes forcibly to my mind, and I propose it coolly and candidly to yours, Whether there is not danger, of not being saved, on a plan which embraces so much error? Gladly would I draw the vail of forgetfulness over these errors; but our brethren in their publications constantly bring them to remembrance. Under these circumstances, we cannot be faithful to our God and to our own consciences; we cannot “contend earnestly for the faith, as it was once delivered to the saints;” we cannot take the stumbling blocks out of the way of God’s people and quit our garments of the blood of souls, except we show them these dangers. Let it be remembered that it is principles with which we contend. Wherever there is piety we venerate it. It is error only that we expose.

And so it is, one error prepares the way, for another. At first the baptism of children must be denied. Then in order to maintain this error, as the covenant made with Abraham, which was the constitution of the church, stood in the way, the church,

of God, "the vineyard which his own right hand hath planted," must be turned into a national, temporal, political, typical church, kingdom and covenant; a covenant of works which could not afford a grounded hope of salvation, but the contrary; which made an obedient subject of their civil government, and a complete member of the church, the same thing; a covenant which promised health, long life, riches, honours, and victory over their enemies, and God for their God, on condition of external obedience, while in their hearts his people were disaffected to him; and to make it easy for them, to perform this obedience, God gave them a ritual service "pretty well adapted to please the carnally minded," and modes of worship, on which multitudes might attend, and find amusement, though in their hearts disaffected to him!!! And even great, and good men, are divided now, whether the seventh day sabbath was ever kept as a day of worship or solely as a day of rest! And in the hands of great and good men, this difficult question, *Whether*, there ever was a sabbath, must be left. Fine sentiments, for the carnally minded sure enough! But on this ground can any mortal tell, how the carnally minded can, in their hearts, be disaffected to God; when things were so agreeable to them?

In the next place, the Old Testament scrip-

tures must fall a sacrifice! Christ Jesus has given a *new edition*, of his own, and of his father's mind and will. Ministers may not transcribe, out of the Old, into the New edition, of God's word and will. To reason from the constitution and government, the laws, usages, and privileges of the Jewish, to those of the Christian church, is to adopt a capital principle of papal depravity, to depend on the Mother of Harlots, and grossly to corrupt our holy religion.

When men treat God's word, and institutions in this manner, nothing more is needed, to convince us, that they are wild and erroneous in the extreme. What would have been said of such sentiments, if they had appeared in the days of our pious, and venerable forefathers?

When Naboth's vineyard was wanted, the plan was, Proclaim a fast, bring false witnesses, and say, Naboth blasphemed God, and the king. So the plan seems to be now. Make a great appearance of inward sanctity, run down the institutions of God, as being pretty well adapted to please the carnally minded, spare not even the sabbath, and if people will not receive all this, if they attempt to reason a syllable, out of the Old Testament, cry Popery, Popery, Mother of Harlots, our holy religion is grossly corrupted, stand by thyself, for I am holier than thou.

Hence those, who stile themselves exclu-

sively, the ministers of Christ, often tell their hearers, it is no matter, or of but little consequence, whether they read the Old Testament or not. Christ (they say) has given a *new edition*, of his own, and his father's mind and will. In this way, poor souls are kept in ignorance and delusion.

Again, those who deny the Old Testament are constrained to pervert much of the New. When they have urged the peculiarities of their *sect*, they exhort their hearers to imitate the noble Bereans, Acts 17. 11. and search the scriptures. Here say they, dear hearers is primitive example, so do ye. But you must go only to the *new edition*, for no man may transcribe out of the *old*, into the *new edition*, of God's word and will. Here is art, subtilty, and sophistry, to a high degree! The example there set, is to search the scriptures of the Old Testament, the Bereans had no other, and the example is a noble one. In these scriptures, they found all Paul's preaching. But to use this text, in the manner it often is used, is a total perversion of it. The same, or similar, observations, might be made, in many other instances.

When we consider these things, have we not reason to fear, that there is danger of not being saved, on a plan which embraces so much error. But here we must exercise much candor, and Christian charity. We cannot indeed say, how far a man may

be in error, and yet his error not be damnable. Some may have much wood, hay, and stubble, and yet be saved so as by fire. It is our duty therefore, to treat them, with tenderness, and provoke unto love and good works. Without charity, we are but a tinkling cymbal, we are nothing.

Let us then be faithful in our labours, and fervent in our prayers, that all prejudices may be removed, that ignorance, error, and superstition, may fall, and, that knowledge, truth, and love, unfeigned, may abound. If they accuse us of Popery, call us legalists, say we depend on the mother of Harlots, say we must stand by our selves, and what not, we must patiently submit to it.

Finally ; let us remember, that we are bound to study the whole book of God, Old Testament and New, with prayerful attention, comparing scriptural things with scriptural ; so that one part shall not contradict another. Near the close of the Bible, we find this solemn admonition, "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him, the plagues, that are written in this book. And if any man shall take away, from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life." Let us then with admiration, read every part of the book of God. It is the book of life, and able to make us wise unto salvation.

A

T R E A T I S E

ON

F R E E C O M M U N I O N

A T T H E

L O R D ' S T A B L E .

1917

NO

THE COMMISSION

AT THE

LEGISLATURE



---

I. CORINTHIANS X. 17.

*For we being many are one bread and one body :  
for we are all partakers of that one bread.*

**T**HESE words were evidently spoken concerning the Lord's supper. In the preceding verse the apostle says, "The cup of blessing which we bless is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread and one body : for we are all partakers of that one bread."

The Lord's supper is a commemoration of Christ's dying love, a renewal of our covenant vows to be faithful to him, and what all Christians are bound to observe. It is the communion of Christ's body and blood. It is not only a duty but a privilege, a most precious privilege to attend upon it. It is the believer's right. "For we being many are one bread and one body : for we are all partakers of that one bread." However Christians may differ in some other things there is certainly no room for them to differ here. The table is the Lord's. If it was our table we might then say who

might and who might not come to it. But now the Lord must say, and we may not forbid the Lord's people.

When we speak of free communion at the Lord's table, *two* things are to be understood as pre-requisites.

1. All who come to the Lord's table must be in visible order, so as to be publicly known, to be the Lord's people. They must have professed Christ before men and solemnly covenanted with the Lord and with the Lord's people. Luke 12. 8. "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God." Rom. 10. 10. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." All who come to the table of the Lord and have communion, in the ordinance of the supper, are required to make this profession, that they may be known as the members of Christ's Church.

2. There must be reason to hope, that such a profession is not hypocritical, but is made in sincerity and truth. This evidence we must have from the tenor of their lives and behavior. "By their fruits ye shall know them." Christians must so live under the influence of that religion which they profess, as in a judgment of charity to give evidence of their friendship to Christ and his cause.

With these prerequisites communion at

the Lord's table is never to be denied. If, to persons in visible order and who in a judgment of charity give reasonable evidence of their sincerity, we deny communion at the Lord's table, we sin against Christ.

But will not these remarks apply to many denominations? Must the same outward formalities in all cases be used to constitute visible order? This plainly is not required. When Christ made known the duty of confessing him before men and encouraged them by the motive of being owned by him at the last day; or when he declared the sin of denying him before men and its awful punishment, he did not point out the particular mode of the profession required. So much is material; the Christian must be known to belong visibly to Christ, must own the obligation of a covenant and in this respect stand distinguished from the world. But as to the particular form, it is not so material. If we think differently here, each one may satisfy his own conscience and the other has no right to be offended. The new Jerusalem hath twelve gates, and why may we not suppose that in matters, which are circumstantial or least essential the way to heaven is not so narrow but twelve denominations may go abreast, or walk side by side and have converse with each other as they go?

In the apostolic age some came into visible order by circumcision, and some by baptism. The apostles themselves were circumcised, but it is no where intimated that they were baptized. This was the case with the whole church at Jerusalem, and with believing Jews in other countries, they preferred and continued circumcision during the whole ministry of the apostles, and by this rite were brought into visible order. Others were brought into visible order by baptism. But this difference could not justify any division or separation. They were never allowed to break fellowship or deny communion, because of this.

The denominations most respectable, for numbers among us at the present day are Presbyterians or Congregationalists, Episcopalians, Methodists and Antipedo-baptists. But because the Episcopalian prefers to have the government of the church in the hands of a bishop and believes either in the necessity or propriety of *confirmation*, shall he for this renounce all other denominations and refuse occasional communion with them all at the Lord's table? Or because Presbyterians and Congregationalists prefer a more republican mode of church government, and do not see the propriety of confirmation, shall they exclude Episcopalians from their communion? And because the dipping baptists choose to be put all over into a brook,

when they are baptized, shall they exclude all the *sprinklers*? Or because the sprinkling baptists believe sprinkling to be the most, or as many do the only scriptural mode shall they exclude or excommunicate all the dippers? These things are doubtless insufficient to excuse any of us in the practice of close communion. The table is the Lord's and not ours. And though there is much more freedom now in coming to the Lord's table, than what there was thirty or forty years ago, yet it is to be lamented, that there is not still much more.

Episcopalians do not positively deny communion with other sects, and though in some instances they actually do commune with others, yet generally they are rather unwilling. Presbyterians and Congregationalists are by no means too free, and what is quite singular, some churches will not commune with others of their own order, though in general they commune not only with churches of their own order, but with other denominations. In respect to communion, Methodists are generally liberal, but not always.

The dipping baptists are divided into two classes, sometimes called close, and sometimes open communion baptists. The open communion baptists are free and liberal to commune with other denominations. But the close communion baptists are extremely rigid; they deny communion with all

the sprinklers, because as they say, they are unbaptized, and with the open communion baptists, because they are such heretics as to commune with the sprinklers.

St. Paul says, Rom. 14. 2. "Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not, and let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth, for God hath received him." Where we have reason to believe that God hath received *any one*, we have no business to neglect him, and we have no right to reject, but where we have evidence that God hath rejected. The scripture is plain.

Again; doctrines of faith are of vastly more importance than things which are circumstantial. But even here where we find people right in fundamental points, we may not reject or excommunicate them for matters of mere opinion or speculation. A man may have an exceeding good heart and a wrong head. If he is influenced by the purest motives he may misjudge. And simply because of an error in judgment, we have no right to excommunicate from the church. It is indeed extremely difficult, if not impossible to draw the line and say how far a man may be in error and yet be a good man. Or, perhaps our brother who differs from us may be right and *we* are in the wrong. Or, if it be true that we are right and he is wrong, then it is our duty to convince and reclaim him. But what measure is most

likely to be successful in convincing and reclaiming him? To hold free communion, converse and society with him, and let enquiry be candid and free, or to excommunicate him in the first onset? Excommunicate him and you fill him with prejudice against you and against the truth forever. The most hopeful way to reclaim him is, as much as possible to guard against his imbibing prejudices. But if his heresy be damnable and he is fixed in it and cannot be reclaimed, then he *must* be excommunicated. This is the last step.

Different denominations may excommunicate each other, or which is the same thing, deny each other the privilege of communion at the Lord's table, for the same crime that they may excommunicate an individual of their own particular church and on no other ground. And every thing for which we may excommunicate may be comprized under two heads, viz. immorality and heresy. These considerations will prepare the way to take a more particular view of that practice called close communion, and offer some arguments to shew that it is inconsistent and unscriptural.

Arg. 1. It is not pretended that either of the before mentioned denominations have embraced any damnable error. The dipping baptists, who are by far the most rigid of any, do not pretend (I mean when they

are serious) that other denominations have embraced damnable errors and heresies. Though they often bring up the sideway reproach of our being connected with or dependent on the mother of harlots, of our having adopted capital principles of papal depravity and grossly corrupting our holy religion. Yet (I say) when they are more serious, they acknowledge that other denominations enjoy God's special favors and grace as much as they do, have the influences of his holy spirit as much as they do, and stand as fair for heaven. The antipedo-baptist association in Connecticut, October 6, 7. 1802, in their corresponding letter have the following paragraph.

“ The kind Lord is not confining the  
 “ *precious* influences of his spirit to any one  
 “ denomination of professing Christians: but  
 “ is displaying his power and making bare his  
 “ omnipotent arm in turning many souls from  
 “ the power of sin and Satan to himself in va-  
 “ rious denominations. When we recog-  
 “ nize a work of this nature we cannot but  
 “ exclaim, this is the Lord's doing and it is  
 “ truly marvellous in our eyes.”

It is then not only against scripture that they deny fellowship, but against principles and facts which they themselves acknowledge. They acknowledge that God has received other denominations while in the practice of infant baptism, which indeed is



no small evidence of its divine original, that God grants them the precious influences of his spirit, displays his power and makes bare his omnipotent arm to replenish and support them. Why then will the unkind baptists refuse to unite with such denominations at the table of the kind Lord? Is not this unchristian being very unlike the kind Lord? Why will they deny those churches where there are works which they themselves acknowledge are the Lord's doings and marvellous in their eyes? Denying fellowship after these confessions is truly marvellous in *our* eyes! Our brethren own that God has *received* us. Why then will they deny the visibility of those churches which he receives, for which he displays his power and makes bare his omnipotent arm? Why will they in a direct manner oppose that most fervent prayer of our blessed Saviour, John 17; especially the 21st verse.

In the paragraph just quoted they are just, candid and Christian like. It was then a time when there had been a remarkable revival of religion among the sprinkling baptists. But to deny communion in contradiction to these precious confessions and the plain word of God, is strange, illiberal and inconsistent, and cannot be accounted for on any religious principles.

When any one denomination can confine Christ and the influences of his spirit, then

they may confine communion, but not before.

Arg. 2. The church of Christ is one and cannot be divided. "We being many are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread." By this symbol all the members of the body must be acknowledged. The word of God is the rule of our faith and practice. We have "one Lord, one faith and one baptism." If we think differently it is because of human frailty and prejudice. And as all Christians have *one* rule of faith and practice, which is the word of God, so we are all incorporated into *one* body, which is the church. Christ says, Cant. 6. 9. "My beloved is *one*, she is the only one of her mother, the choice one of her that bare her." All Christians are by Christ incorporated into one body, and this body cannot be divided. To the Jews Christ said, John 10. 14. "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold. Them also I must bring and they shall hear my voice and there shall be *one* fold and one shepherd." Christ here acknowledges the Jewish church to contain his disciples. It was a fold which contained his sheep. But he had other sheep. The gentiles yet out of covenant were viewed in the divine mind as though already brought in. Them also (Christ saith) I must bring and they shall hear my voice (they had not heard it yet)

and there shall be *one* fold and *one* shepherd. The church may be scattered over the whole world, yet it is but *one* church. There is one body and one bread, for we are all partakers of that one bread. So Christ prays John 17. 21. "That they all may be one, as thou father art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

As Christ hath incorporated all Christians into one body, so he prays for their union. "That they all may be one." Not they in *part* but they *all*. They must breathe one spirit and strive together to maintain one cause. The spirit which they are required to breathe is the spirit of love, and the cause which they must maintain is the cause of the Redeemer. It is one interest which they are bound to support, viz. the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom. For this, all Christians must unite in their prayers and in their labours. Each one must repair over against his own house, and build the city, which a great king hath set up. The opposition made to religion, is such, that the united efforts of all Christians are required to counteract it. The enemies of religion are united in their efforts to destroy it, and it is required of all Christians that they should be united to support it. It is not our own cause which we must strive to maintain, but the cause of God. The cause for which the

son of God came down from heaven to earth, and suffered, and bled, and died ! Nothing is more hurtful to this cause, nothing gives the adversary greater pleasure or more advantage, than to see Christians divided, and instead of fighting him they fight one another. Nothing is more pleasing to him, than to see Christians treat one another with coldness, sourness and contempt, and shut one another from the table of the Lord.

In the passage just quoted, Jesus prays that all Christians may be *one*, and assigns for a reason, “ that the *world* may believe that thou hast sent me.” In other words that religion is true. This reason is strong and ought to come with equal weight to every believer’s heart. By the *world* here we are to understand all who are not Christians, unbelievers and such as are out of the visible church, and are enemies to it. These have souls to save which are precious in the eyes of Christ. He invites these to turn by repentance and accept of offered mercy. He pursues them in every direction, and requires that every possible mean should be used for their conversion, and what mean so likely to be successful as the unity of his disciples ? Nothing is more convincing of the truth of religion, than the unity of Christians, and nothing brings a greater wound than the want of it. Every consideration aside from the Redeemer’s interest must be giv-

en up. Here is the greatest difficulty. When we discover the true cause of separations and divisions among Christians, we generally find something short of real religion. When Christian unity and brotherly love prevails, it has a powerful tendency to convince those who make opposition. They feel themselves reprov'd and convinc'd of all. Jesus says, John 13. 35. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples if ye have love one to another." And what shall men know when professing Christians either have not, or else withhold their love? What shall they know when party spirit runs high; when party distinctions, and names are exhibited, in broad characters, like the phylacteries of the selfrighteous pharisees? This feeds their opposition, and shuts conviction from their hearts. They look on and say there is nothing in religion. Thus Christ is wounded in the house of his friends, and poor sinners stumble into hell, over the party spirit, of professing Christians!!!

If then professing Christians are moved by the love of God, by love and pity to the souls of perishing sinners, by love to that cause for which the son of God did bleed and die; if they would persuade the men of this world to embrace Christ, and allure them by the beauties of his religion, if they would strike conviction into the hearts of sinners by the majesty of truth and love, they must

lay aside party distinctions, divisions, and discords, and be as Christ both prays and commands. When there are differences in religion a cause of stumbling is laid before the sincere enquirer. He says I know not which way is right and sometimes I conclude that all religion is only in pretence. And if at any time the open opposers of religion are convicted by the spirit of Christ, by the power of his word, or by their own consciences, party spirit and discord among Christians, soon checks it, and helps forward the kingdom of satan.

And is it so that humble enquirers or stubborn enemies shall stumble over these divisions and fall into everlasting burnings? How cutting the thought! If then the church would be amiable to her friends, formidable to her enemies, and glorious, in the eyes of her beloved, she must be united. There is one body, and one bread: for we are all partakers of that one bread. The unity of the church proves against close communion. Christ has constituted the church and made it one. Christ's order must be given up or close communion must be given up, but Christ's order must not be given up; therefore close communion *must* be given up.

Arg. 3. To deny communion with Christian brethren, is inconsistent with Christian charity. When one denomination denies communion with another, it is saying that

the other does not belong to the visible church of Christ, and has no right to the ordinances of Christ. Because if a Christian has a right to go to the table of the Lord in one town and with one particular church he has in and with another. Denying him in one place to enjoy the privilege of the Lord's table, is virtually to say he has no business to enjoy the privilege any where. Here is something very wrong. This is the spirit of error. The table of our heavenly father is spread and the children of our heavenly father are forbid to come and take their portion. They are denied membership in the family and sent away grieved from their father's table. Not because they have not received the adoption of sons, but because they cannot in their consciences deny the baptism of their children. Close communion I say is inconsistent with Christian charity. Christian charity must be given up or else close communion must be given up, but Christian charity must *not* be given up; therefore close communion *must* be given up.

The close communicant will endeavour to get away from the argument just laid down, from the unity of the church, by acknowledging that Christ's church is but one, but it is confined says he to my denomination. Christ he says has no visible church in any other; if he had we would commune with them, with all our hearts, but there is

a vast difference between other denominations and us. In what says the open communicant does this mighty difference consist? Do not other denominations possess saving grace as well as you? I acknowledge it says the close communicant. I will not deny but other denominations in proportion to their numbers have as many gracious persons as we. Does not Christ, says the free communicant, own and bless other denominations, as well as yours, does he not commune with them at the holy table, and do they not stand as fair for heaven and all the enjoyments of the blessed? All this says the close communicant I am ready to acknowledge. Where then says the other is this mighty difference you speak of? On what ground do you feel authorized to excommunicate them from the church of God? They have not, says the close communicant, complied with our modes and forms therefore I will not receive them to the table of the Lord. I will not allow that sprinkling is baptism, and therefore they have not been baptized.—Let them renounce their baptism and be baptized as I have been by immersion and let them interpret the word of God as I do or rather let me interpret it for them and then I will commune with them.

Here let us apply what the apostle says to the church at Corinth, where several divisions sprang up. 1 Epist. 1. 10. "Now I be-



seech you brethren by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ that ye all speak the same thing and that there be no divisions among you ; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." In the 13th verse he makes the solemn demand, " Is Christ divided ?" If Christ cannot be divided we may not have any division in the church. At the 3d verse of the 3d chapter he further says, " For whereas there is among you envying and strife and divisions are ye not carnal, and walk as men ? For while one faith I am of Paul ; and another I am of Apollos are ye not carnal ?"

Again, 13. 1. " Though I speak with the tongues of men and angels and have not charity I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." " Though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge : and tho' I have all faith so that I could remove mountains and have not charity I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor and though I give my body to be *burned* and have not charity it profiteth me nothing." " Charity suffereth long and is kind : charity envieth not ; charity vaunteth not itself ; is not puffed up." " Doth not behave itself unseemly ; seeketh not her own ; is not easily provoked ; thinketh no evil ;" " Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth." " Beareth all things ; believeth all

things; hopeth all things; endureth all things." "Charity never faileth." "Now abideth faith, hope and charity these three but the greatest of these is charity."

Let us now consider the difference between the parties. The dipping baptist verily believes in his conscience, that *dipping* is the only scriptural mode of baptism, and I as verily believe in my conscience that *sprinkling* is the only mode of baptism which is scriptural. What is the difference? It is only about water not about grace. And in this respect it requires as great condescension on the one side as on the other or else the parties can never come together. On one side this condescension is generously made, on the other it is withheld.

The difference I said was about water, not about grace. Christian charity will certainly lead us to make all real or seeming differences as little as possible. Prejudice will make them as great as possible. Without charity the apostle tells us a man is nothing, has no religion. This charity does certainly forbid to excommunicate and unchurch the church of God for the sake of modes and forms. Christian charity must be given up, or else close communion must be given up; but if charity is given up all religion is given up. Charity then must not be given up; consequently close communion *must* be given up.

Charity in this place requires me to believe that many of the close communion baptists, have done what they have, without ever considering the consequences, or the inconsistency of the close communion sentiments.

Arg. 4. In heaven communion is free. The church on earth is designed to imitate the church in heaven ; therefore communion ought to be free here. There is no such thing as close communion in heaven. All close communion sentiments must be left on this side of heaven. Rev. 7. 9, 10, 11. "And I beheld and lo a great multitude which no man could number, of all nations and kingdoms and people, and tongues stood before the throne and before the Lamb clothed with white robes and palms in their hands, and cried with a loud voice saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth on the throne and unto the Lamb. And all the angels stood round about the throne and the four beasts, and fell down before the throne on their faces and worshipped God saying, Amen, Blessing and glory and wisdom and thanksgiving and honour and power and might be unto our God forever and ever Amen." Here is a chorus, all is unison and harmony, complete and perfect ; and it is the duty of the church here on earth to imitate the church in heaven. But as we just said close communion sentiments cannot go to heaven. These certainly make a considera-

ble part of the wood, the hay and the stubble which the fire must consume.

Arg. 5. It is a high degree of religious tyranny, intolerance, oppression and persecution, to excommunicate, from and deny our brethren the privileges of the church merely upon a case of conscience. This is to make a case of conscience a crime in the same manner as a case of open scandal or immorality. One brother believes in his conscience that he ought to give his children to God in covenant. Now is that a crime which a man thinks he ought in his own conscience to do as a duty? It is acknowledged he is sincere, and has grace in his heart. May he not then be allowed to exercise his own judgment, in such a manner as to answer his own conscience without being excommunicated from the church? Certainly he must, to deprive him of this right is inconsistent with all religion, and is a high degree of religious oppression and persecution. It is the very principle on which all the persecutions have been conducted.

There is no instance in the Gospel where any person was ever excommunicated, or even censured, for a case of conscience, nor any direction given for any such thing, but directly the contrary. In the case of meats there was a difference of sentiment in the apostolic age. One could and another could not, eat with a good conscience. But no

man in this case was allowed to censure, offend and much less to excommunicate his brother. Hence we learn that the Gospel does not allow of excommunicating from the church, for a case of conscience. St. Paul says, 1 Cor. 8. 12. "But when ye sin so against the brethren and wound their weak conscience ye sin against Christ." 10. 27. "Whatsoever is set before you eat asking no questions for conscience sake. But if any man say unto you, This is offered in sacrifice unto idols, eat not for his sake that shewed it, and for conscience sake. Conscience I say not thine own, but of the other: for why is my liberty judged by another man's conscience?" It is here plain that one man, is not to make his own conscience a rule for his brother: but every man is allowed the right of his own conscience. And to wound even the weak conscience is to sin against Christ. It will not answer for one to say he cannot in his conscience commune with his brother, for that which his brother, in his conscience does. Each one is allowed the right of his own conscience, and yet is allowed to remain in the church, and in the enjoyment of its privileges.

Perhaps there is no denomination, who in principle admit the idea of censuring and excommunicating for a case of conscience and yet it is brought up in practice and carried to so great a degree as to excommuni-

cate whole denominations and such as are vastly numerous. Our brethren will not allow us to exercise our own conscience with regard to baptism, and yet have a standing in the visible church of God !

Mr. Merrill often repeats it that there is no baptism short of plunging the body all over, and the design of baptism he says page 39, "Is for a dividing line between the kingdoms of our Lord and the kingdoms of this world." And page 61 "It is among many other things the great dividing line which heaven hath appointed, to be drawn between the visible kingdom of Immanuel and the men of this world." According to him all the pious saints both before and after the reformation, even from the apostles down to the present day, even all the pious ministers as Calvin, Luther, Baxter, Flavel, Doddridge, Watts, Whitfield, Edwards, and numerous others with the pious churches under their care, with all our pious and venerable forefathers who fled to this land of liberty, are not allowed a standing in the visible kingdom of Christ, were all intruders at the Lord's table, are ranked with the enemies of God, and cast out, where "are dogs and forcerers and whoremongers and murderers and idolaters and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie." This we say is uncharitable and inconsistent with the rights of conscience.

Arg. 6. The millennial state of the church cannot take place until union and harmony is restored. Zech. 8. 9. For then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the Lord to serve him with one consent. Again, Isaiah 52. 8. "Thy watchmen shall lift up the voice: with the voice together shall they sing. For they shall see eye to eye when the Lord shall bring again Zion." It is reasonable then to believe that there shall be a preparation work before that time, in uniting the hearts of the people of God, in doing away prejudices and in increasing love. We may here observe also, that those churches which have the most Christian charity are the nearest to the millennial state, and what is more they are the nearest to the heavenly state; and those who have the least Christian charity are the furthest off from both.

It is a most tender and affecting consideration, that many pious Christians are driven from the table of the Lord. Mr. Joseph Marshall, a celebrated separate preacher, has laboured much among the dipping baptists. They have received him with passionate fondness as an eminent servant of Christ, but have never allowed him to come with them to the table of the Lord, because he believed in his conscience that infant baptism was right. Mr. Marshall has often complained of this treatment and said, It is hard, when I

have laboured all day, that I should be denied a piece of bread, that I may not be allowed to come to my father's table and receive the portion of a child. This eminent servant of God has often gone from the uncovered table of the Lord, with a wounded heart. Similar instances have often happened.

In a neighbouring state, as I have been told, a man of known piety and by profession a member of a pedo-baptist church, requested communion with a dipping baptist church, as it was more convenient, than any one of his own denomination. They said, no you may not come with us. He replied, Is it not the children's bread? And am I not a child? They said, We believe you are a child, but have not as we think been baptized, and you may not come with us to the table of the Lord. He replied, Do you not think God owns me as a child and will receive me to heaven? They answered, we do. He replied again, You acknowledge me to be a child, I ask to receive a child's portion at my father's table. You deny me this privilege which my father grants me. I have only one thing more that I can do and that I must do. I will go and tell Father of you. They were afraid of Father, and so let him come.


But the greatest evil is that the unbelieving world take great advantage and often believe religion is not true. How then shall



we quit our garments of their blood, if we cause them to stumble and fall? It is extremely unhappy that the more we condescend to invite our brethren to free communion, the more they fly from us, as though we should gain some advantage. But that is not the case. We seek this free communion for the reason which Christ assigns, That we all may be one as he and the father are one, that the world may believe that the father hath sent him. We do it lest guilty and hardened sinners should stumble over our divisions and thereby fall into hell. We do it lest God our heavenly father should be angry at our want of love, and hardness of heart.

Behold! how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. Let us lay aside those sentiments which are repugnant to scripture and which cannot go to heaven.

THE END.



---

AN

A P P E N D I X,

TO THE ARGUMENT FOR THE SABBATH, 139<sup>th</sup>  
PAGE.

MARK ii. 27, 28.

*And he said unto them, The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath: Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.*

AS it pleased God to ordain and institute public worship, so he was pleased to set apart and designate a particular day for that purpose. Gen. 2. 2, 3. "On the seventh day God ended his work which he had made: and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God had created and made." This is the account of the institution of the sabbath. God himself ceased from his labor, sanctified and blessed the day on which he rested.

The sabbath we see was instituted from

the creation of the world, while man was in a state of innocency. "God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it." It was sanctified and blessed in distinction from the other days of the week. On other days man might dress the garden and cultivate the fruits of it; but the day which God had sanctified and blessed must be *observed* as a sanctified day. Had man never sinned there must have been a sabbath, because before the fall of man God was pleased to institute a sabbath, sanctify the day and make it holy, in distinction from other days. Things which are consecrated immediately to the service of God are in the scriptures said to be sanctified, and are called holy.

It appears then that man in a state of innocence was as much bound to observe the seventh part of time in holy resting from the common labors and employments of life, and in performing the duties of religion, as he was to be honest, chaste, temperate and obedient to every other precept of the moral law; and a breach of the sabbath, as much as idolatry or theft, would have been a breach of the moral law.

The sons of Adam it is said Gen. 4. 3. "In process of time came to bring an offering unto the Lord." It is in the margin of the Bible, "At the end of days." There were days it seems for their common employments in their various occupations and at the end

of these days they came and brought their offerings unto the Lord. This was undoubtedly on the day which God had sanctified and blessed in distinction from the other days of the week.

We have no more mention of the sabbath until we are informed, that it was kept by the Jews in the wilderness, before the giving either of the moral or the ceremonial law. Moses says, Exo. 16. 23. "Tomorrow is the rest of the holy sabbath." He goes on to tell them that the manna would not be found on the sabbath day. He speaks of the sabbath as a thing which was well known and familiar to the people. Had it not been for this circumstance of the manna it is not probable that any mention would have been made of the sabbath at this time. Doubtless good men kept the sabbath from the time of its institution, but those who were wicked and idolatrous probably paid no attention to it.

When the moral law was written on tables of stone the command for the sabbath was one of the first table. "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy." And to neglect the duties of the sabbath, to profane that holy day, or treat it with irreverence, was a crime for which the offender was punished with as much severity as he was for breaking any precept of the moral law whatever. Indeed God complains of his people

more for their neglect and misimprovement of the sabbath, than for the neglect of any other moral duty. This sin was of the same nature as idolatry. Ezekiel 20. 16. "They despised my judgments and walked not in my statutes, but polluted my sabbaths : For their heart went after their idols."

Our blessed saviour was strictly exemplary on the sabbath. Luke 4. 16. "Jesus as his *custom* was went into the synagogue on the sabbath day." The greatest accusation that his enemies the scribes and pharisees could bring against him concerning the sabbath was, that in some instances he had healed the sick, and in one instance his disciples, as a matter of necessity, to satisfy their hunger, had plucked a few ears of corn on the sabbath day.

The sabbath then was sanctified and blessed from the creation of the world, is a part of the moral law, and of perpetual obligation, as much as any other of the ten commandments. On this day the people of God assembled together, that they might unitedly and publicly worship God according to his own direction. God said unto them Levit. 19. 30. "Ye shall keep my sabbaths and reverence my sanctuary." Again, "I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me and before *all the people* will I be glorified."

On this day God required his ministers to assemble with the people, deliver his mes-

fages, read and expound his word and instruct the people according to his own direction. Prayers and offerings were presented on every sabbath. Numb. 28. 10. "This is the burnt offering of *every* sabbath, besides the continual burnt offering and his drink offering."

Our blessed saviour who himself set us the example of keeping the sabbath says, "The sabbath was made for man and not man for the sabbath : therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath." As the business of this day is wholly of a religious nature, so the sanctification of a particular day for the performance of religious duties is a peculiar blessing of God. This is what man needed. "The sabbath was made for man." Man is not a slave to an arbitrary and useless institution, but is blessed with an institution made for him ; for his good ; made that man might be allowed to come near unto God in acts of divine worship, the noblest of all employments, enjoy *sweet* communion with and receive instruction from God. The sabbath like every thing else which God hath done for man, is for man's good. We might know it is for our good, because it comes from God, and is made for us. Good men have always felt it to be a privilege and a blessing. The Psalmist says, 42. 2, 4. "My soul thirsteth for God, when shall I come and appear before God." "When I remember

these things, I pour out my soul in me: for I had gone with the multitude; I went with them to the house of God with the voice of joy and praise, with the multitude that kept holy day."

The sabbath is a peculiar token of God's favor. Ezek. 20. 12. "Moreover also I gave them my sabbaths to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify them."

Nehemiah recounting the mercies of God to the people of Israel says, 9. 14. "Thou madest known unto them thine holy sabbaths." He considers it one of the richest of God's blessings. It is highly probable, that the sabbath had been much interrupted by reason of the corruption and wickedness of idolatrous ages and nations, and especially by the oppressive measures of the Egyptians. Probably the sabbath would have been lost had not the precept been often renewed and the duty as often enforced.

If then there is not satisfactory evidence that the sabbath is changed from the seventh to the first day of the week by the resurrection of Christ, it is certain that the obligation still remains in full force which requires the observance of the seventh day; because as we have seen already, the sabbath was sanctified and blessed from the creation of the world, before man sinned, is a part of the moral law and must be of perpetual obliga-



tion. Exod. 20. 8. "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work : but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God : in it thou shalt not do any work, thou nor thy son, nor thy daughter nor thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is and rested the seventh day : wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day and hallowed it."

Those who deny the sabbath offer many reasons, which indeed are foolish, whimsical and erroneous. The sabbath, they say, belonged to that part of the former dispensation which is abolished. But we have before shewn, that the sabbath was no part of the ceremonial law, because it was sanctified, and blessed before sin entered into the world.

They say again, There is no command in the New Testament, to keep the sabbath, especially the first day sabbath, and we are not bound to keep the first day, except there is a command for it. But God may signify his mind and will without a command as well as with, and when it is signified we are as much bound to obey it, as though the command was of the most positive nature and delivered by the solemnity of awful thun-

ders, as at Sinai. We find the Jews in the wilderness, as we have before noticed keeping the sabbath, before the command was given. They knew the mind and will of God in that particular and were under infinite obligation to obey it. It was not the fourth commandment which sanctified the sabbath, and which laid men under obligation to keep it; but it was God's resting from the work of creation. In the fourth commandment the duty which men were always bound to perform, is renewedly made known and the reason assigned which we have before mentioned, that in resting from the work of creation God did sanctify and bless the day.

Again they say, It is a matter of doubt whether the seventh day sabbath was ever appointed for the purposes of religion, or solely for a day of rest. Shocking evidence of delusion!

They say again; Under the former dispensation a breach of the sabbath was punished with death, but this is not the case now; therefore the sabbath belonged to the former dispensation. So adultery was punished with death (Levit. 20. 10.) and is not now. But does this alter the nature of adultery? Does it prove that chastity belonged only to the former dispensation? Moral obligation to chastity was the same before the giving of the moral law, and the law which punish-

ed the breach of it with death, as it was after these precepts were given ; and it is the same *now*. It was no part of the moral law to annex any other punishment than the wrath of God, to any crime whatever. It was the municipal law which inflicted human or temporal punishments. This law may vary as the public good may require, but the moral law can never vary.

The change of the day does by no means militate against the morality of the sabbath. Only a seventh part of time was from the creation, hallowed and blessed for spiritual improvement. The fourth commandment says, " Remember the *sabbath* day to keep it holy. Wherefore the Lord blessed the *sabbath* day and hallowed it." The sabbath is not confined by this commandment to the seventh day. It does not say, Remember the *seventh* day to keep it holy, but Remember the *sabbath* day. It is true the seventh day was then the sabbath, but if God has since sanctified the first, instead of the seventh, the nature of moral obligation is as well answered by *keeping* the first instead of the seventh ; and the fourth commandment will in that case virtually apply to the first day, instead of the seventh ; because the reason given in the fourth commandment for the seventh day will be superceded by a greater reason for the first day. But to deny as many do, that a sabbath still remains, is not only

to deny plain scripture evidence, but it is to deny, that the obligation, of the moral law, is perpetual.

It is evident not only from many prophecies in the Old Testament but from many expressions in the New, that a sabbath was to continue to the end of the world. When Christ says, "The sabbath was made for man," he undoubtedly comprehends all men in all ages of the world. The word *man* is often used indefinitely or figuratively, for all men in all ages of the world. When Job says, "*Man* that is born of a woman is of few days and full of trouble," Or when Solomon says, "*Man* dieth and goeth to his long home," Or when Christ says, "*Man* shall not live by bread alone, the meaning is man in every age. So when Christ says, "The sabbath was made for *man*," he comprehends all men in all ages of the world. The sabbath must continue as long as man continues.

Again ; can we suppose that God would institute a church and appoint a divine worship and not appropriate a particular day for that purpose ? God is a God of order, and not of confusion. Under the present dispensation the church of Christ would be greatly embarrassed was there not a day set apart for the purpose of religious transactions. If every one is left at liberty to worship God, only when he pleases, or when it is conven-

ient for his business it would be impossible for the church to preserve her unity and order, as well as impossible to maintain her dignity.

Man certainly needs a sabbath now as much as formerly. "The sabbath is made for man and not man for the sabbath. Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath."

II. We will now consider some of the evidence which the scriptures afford us, that the sabbath was changed from the seventh to the first day of the week.

Christ being the Lord of the sabbath had an undoubted right to change the day and order every thing respecting it as it pleased him. Christ is in every sense "Lord of the sabbath." It was Christ who created this world and at the beginning sanctified the sabbath by his resting from that important work. John 1. 3. "All things were made by him and without him was not any thing made that was made." This is spoken of Christ. Colos. 1. 16. "For by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him and for him." This also is spoken of Christ. And the same idea is contained, Eph. 3. 9. Heb. 1. 2.

It was Christ then who did at first institute, and by his resting from the work of

creation sanctify the sabbath. As Christ was the immediate agent in the work of creation, so the sabbath was at first kept in honour to Christ, and in remembrance of his work. From the beginning, Christ is Lord of the sabbath day.

Again; the Jews in the wilderness were required to keep the sabbath in remembrance of their deliverance out of Egypt. Deut. 5. 15. "Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence with a stretched out arm. Therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day." This deliverance was the immediate act of Christ and typical of a still more glorious deliverance from the slavery of sin and Satan, which Christ would effect by his sufferings and death.

In all ages the sabbath has had an immediate reference to the work of Christ, and his greatest work was the atonement which he completed when he rose from the dead. And as his resting from his work of creation sanctified the seventh day, so his resting from his work of redemption sanctified the first day. In resting he sanctified the seventh and also the first day. The reason therefore for the first day sabbath is greater than for the seventh, because Christ rested from a greater work. This is enough to show us that the seventh day sabbath is superceded and the first day takes its place.

After his resurrection on "the first day of the week at even when the disciples were together, Jesus came and stood in the midst and said, Peace be unto you." After eight days the disciples were gathered together and Jesus appeared unto them again and saluted them in the same manner. This also was the first day of the week. They reckoned the day on which he appeared the first time *one* and then the same day of the week would be eight. This was a common method of reckoning among the Jews.

In rising from the dead on the first day of the week and in appearing twice to his disciples on that day and saluting them with his Peace the Lord of the sabbath seems plainly to intimate the sanctification of that day.

The day of Pentecost, mentioned in the second chapter of Acts, when the Holy Ghost was poured out in such a wonderful manner was also the first day of the week. This, as the word signifies, was the fiftieth day after the second day of the passover. Levit. 23. 15. "And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offering; seven sabbaths shall be complete, even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath shall ye number fifty days." Seven sabbaths complete is forty nine days and the first day of the week after the seventh sabbath was the fiftieth day. This

was the pentecost. By pouring out his holy spirit in that wonderful manner, Acts 2. 3. and by directing the apostles to preach the glad tidings of the gospel first on that day, and by granting such wonderful success, the great head of the church did plainly enough signify that this day had been hallowed by his rising from the dead and blessed for the same glorious purposes, for which the seventh day sabbath had formerly been hallowed and blessed.

Again; the change of the sabbath was foretold in prophecy. Psalm 95. 6. "O come let us worship and bow down: Let us kneel before the Lord our maker, for he is our God and we are the people of his pasture and the sheep of his hand. To-day if ye will hear his voice harden not your heart." This passage the apostle uses to prove the Christian sabbath, which like the seventh day sabbath is a type of the heavenly rest. Heb. 4. 4. "For he spake in a certain place of the seventh day on this wise, "And God did rest the seventh day from all his works." Verse 7. "Again he limiteth a certain day saying in (by) David, *To-day* if ye will hear his voice harden not your hearts. For if Jesus (Joshua) had given them the true rest, then would not he (the Holy Ghost by David) afterwards have spoken of another day." The apostle here first speaks of the seventh day which had been sanc-



tified by Christ's resting from the work of creation, and limited by the Lord of the sabbath. But he says, "Again, he limiteth a certain day." That is, afterwards, or a second time; and this certain limited day is not the seventh, but another in distinction from the seventh. Therefore saith the apostle verse 9. "There remaineth therefore a rest unto the people of God." The word which is here translated rest is sabbatismos, which properly signifies and is rendered in the margin of the Bible. "The keeping of a sabbath," The word translated rest elsewhere in this chapter is katapausis which is used to signify the heavenly rest; and had the apostle meant the same here undoubtedly, he would have used the same word. The apostle closes his argument by offering the same reason for the new sabbath which had been given for the seventh day sabbath. Verse 10. "For he (Christ) that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works as God did from his." He, (Christ) who hath entered into his rest, (passed into the heavens verse 14th) hath ceased from his work of atonement which he performed in the character of God man mediator, in the same manner as he ceased from his work of creation, which he performed in the character of God only. And as his resting from the work of creation sanctified the day, on which he rested, so his resting from the work of

redemption sanctified the day on which he rested also. This was foretold and limited in prophecy, by the phrase *today*. This phrase the Psalmist uses, not for the time when he was speaking but for the day on which Christ should rise from the dead. Psalm 2. 7. "Thou art my Son this day (or today) have I begotten thee." This Psalm contains a prophecy of Christ. In the three first verses the Psalmist describes the conduct of Christ's enemies in putting him to death. "Why do the heathen rage and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord and against his anointed, &c.:" The vanity of their proceeding is then stated. "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh." The reason is given in the seventh verse. "Thou art my Son this day have I begotten thee." That is this day have I raised thee up from the dead, to the astonishment and confusion of thine enemies. This passage is quoted, Acts 13. 33. as pointing out and foretelling Christ's rising from the dead. "In that he hath raised up Jesus again as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son this day have I begotten thee." The same passage is quoted again, Heb. 5. 5. and rendered *today* which is the literal and proper meaning.

It is then very evident that the meaning of the passage, "This day (literally today) have I begotten thee," is the day of Christ's

rising from the dead ; today have I raised thee from the dead. Hence he is called Col. 1. 18. " The first born from the dead." And Rev. 1. 5. " The first begotten from the dead."

In the 95th Psalm as before quoted the phrase today is again used and spoken of as a day of public worship. " O come let us worship and bow down, let us kneel before the Lord our maker. For he is our God and we are the people of his pasture and the sheep of his hand. *Today* if ye will hear his voice harden not your hearts."

Again, the phrase *today* is used Psalm 118. 23. in the same sense. " The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner. This is the Lord's doing and it is marvelous in our eyes. This is the day (literally today) the Lord hath made." In all these passages the original word is the same, which literally signifies *today* and as we said before is not used for the time when the Psalmist was speaking but for the day of Christ's rising from the dead, which in these passages is spoken of as a day of public worship, as the day which the Lord hath made or sanctified, a day in which God's people should rejoice.

The apostles understood this phrase *today* (as it is used in these prophecies) to limit, in distinction from the seventh, a certain day of rest, a sabbath unto the people of God.

It was to be the day on which the Saviour should rise from the dead, which proved to be the first day of the week.

The day which Christ had put such a distinguished honour upon, was also honoured by his disciples and followers. On this day the most solemn and important acts of devotion were performed. Religious congregations assembled together, the voice of Christ was proclaimed, that is, the gospel of a risen Saviour was preached, and the ordinances of the New Testament were administered. The day was known in the church by the distinguished name of the LORD'S DAY.

It does not appear however, that the sabbath was suddenly changed, but the contrary. Such a thing could not be brought about, at once, without great prejudice to the cause of religion. The Jews, among whom the gospel was first preached, were strongly attached to the former day, and they had reason to be. The great head of the church, who sanctified both the seventh, and the first day sabbath, did not require a sudden change. It was necessary, that the people should have knowledge and instruction, before, with a good conscience, they could leave the former sabbath. When the apostles were among the Jews, who had not embraced the doctrine, of a risen Saviour, they did for a considerable time observe the seventh day sabbath. But as soon as chur-

ches were regularly formed, which embraced a risen Saviour, then the first day sabbath was observed.

At Antioch, Paul and his companions "went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and sat down. And after the reading of the law, and the prophets, the rulers of the synagogue sent unto them, saying, Ye men and brethren, if ye have any word of exhortation for the people say on." "And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the gentiles besought, that these words might be preached unto them the next sabbath. And the next sabbath day came almost the whole city together, to hear the word of God." Acts 13. 14, 15, 42, 43. "At Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews," "Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the scriptures." Acts 17. 2. At Corinth "he reasoned in the synagogue every sabbath." Acts 18. 4. These were doubtless the seventh day sabbaths.

The change of the day, was not sudden. The apostles continued to honour the same day, as had been honoured, by the performance of religious duties, until churches were formed which acknowledged a risen Saviour; then they paid the same attention to the first day, as had formerly been paid, to the seventh, and in the same manner distinguished

it, from all other days, by the performance of the same duties.

At Troas Paul abode seven days, and upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread Paul preached, unto them, ready to depart on the morrow. Acts 20. 6. In this place, a christian church had been formed. The first day of the week, was a stated day for them to assemble together, for religious worship, even for the highest and most important acts of devotion. Paul waited for this day. He was doubtless willing to preach the gospel on any day : but the *first day* of the week was a day peculiar for that business, and for other acts of devotion, as the seventh day had been before. This was that *other certain limited* day, the day on which Christ rose from the dead.

Again, St. Paul says, 1 Cor. 16. 2. "Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you, lay by him in store as God hath prospered him." He was now exhorting them to make a collection for the poor saints. Giving of Alms, is considered, in the scriptures, an act of piety and religion. Alms, given to the poor, are said to be lent unto the Lord, Prov. 19. 17. and are called the offerings of God, Luke 21. 4. This duty as well as preaching the word, and breaking bread was required to be performed, on the first day of the week.

Again, St. John says, Rev. 1. 10. "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day." He informs the churches from which he had been taken by persecution, what special communion he had with God on the Lord's day, though he was now banished to a desolate Island. Several things are here worthy of further notice. It pleased the great head of the church, to make known to John, On the Lord's day, those glorious and wonderful discoveries, which are recorded, in this book, hereby signifying that the day was holy.

The sabbath was, not only a day, for men to draw near to God, but a day, for God to make known the rich discoveries of his grace to men. The Prophet Ezekiel had his visions once in seven days, which were undoubtedly on the sabbath days. Ezekiel 3. 16. "And it came to pass, at the end of seven days, that the word of the Lord came unto me." This was seven days after the vision mentioned in the first chapter. Commentators understand, that these revelations were made to Ezekiel on the sabbath. So John experienced the same favour on the first day of the week, which was then called the *Lord's day*. John, in his vision, saw the seven churches, which he had left, assembled together on that day, and Jesus walking in the midst of them. And from the apostolic age, down to the present time, the first day

of the week, has been regarded, by Christians, with very little variation of sentiment, as a sanctified day.

*Reflections.*—I. We learn from this subject, how we ought to consider, and improve the first day of the week. It is God's holy sabbath. It is the Lord's day, sanctified by Christ's rising from the dead, and entering into his rest. The pouring out of God's holy spirit, on the day of Pentecost, and the practice of the apostles, are witnesses that this day is holy. The mind, and will of God, was also expressed in prophecy. It was foretold, that the day of Christ's rising from the dead, should be the day of public worship. The fourth commandment, which saith, Remember the sabbath day, and which requires us to labour six days, does virtually apply to the first day as well as to the seventh, especially, if there is a greater reason for the *first*, than for the *seventh*. This day then must be improved in the duties of religion. Without doubt, the scriptures, may be read to better advantage on this day than on other days. If we duly consider Christ's rising from the dead, and entering into his rest, together with other things, intimately connected with that event, it will bring a solemnity upon our minds, highly favourable to the study of the scriptures, and other acts of devotion. On this day, we should seek, for special communion with God.



John was in the spirit on the Lord's day. From the experiences of ancient saints, we are encouraged to hope for greater degrees of spiritual communion, on the sabbath than on other days, Isaiah 51. 13. "If thou call the sabbath a delight, the *holy* of the Lord honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord, and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

Again, we cannot duly observe this day, except we go to the house of God, and pay our devotion there, to our great creator. God said, "Ye shall keep my sabbaths, and reverence my sanctuary." God did of old ordain, that his people should meet together, on the sabbath, that sacrifice should be offered unto him, that his people should unite in their devotions, and that his ministers should read, and expound his holy word. This was the business of the prophets, and ordinary ministers, and also of Jesus Christ on the seventh, and of the apostles, and their successors on the first day sabbath. On these days the gospel evidently had its greatest effects; witness the day of Pentecost; witness, Paul's preaching three sabbaths at Thessalonica, when some of the Jews believ-

ed, and of the devout Greeks a great multitude and of the chief women not a few. Acts 18. 4. Witness one sabbath at Berea, when many of the Jews believed, also of honourable women which were Greeks, and of men not a few.

All servile labour, and secular employment, is forbidden on the sabbath, excepting in cases of necessity, and mercy. Our Saviour hath told us, that a man may lead a horse to the water, and lift a beast out of the pit, on the sabbath day, and there may be instances where other property, may be in such danger, as to justify our taking care of it, on the sabbath. But we must use all possible endeavours previous to the sabbath to prevent cases of necessity from happening.

It has been acknowledged, by many infidels, such as deists and atheists, that the sabbath is an important institution, as it respects the interests, and happiness of society, in the present life, that man needs as much rest, from the common labours and employments of life, as one day in seven; and that to attend on the duties of public worship, serves more than any thing else, to improve the mind, soften the manners, and cement the bonds of civil society. This is undoubtedly a matter of fact, and a strong evidence that the sabbath is of moral obligation; for whatever tends to general or universal good, is of moral obligation. Yet there are those,

who are worse than infidels, who advocate the idea, that it is inconsistent, for the civil magistrate, to suppress, and restrain, the licentiousness of mankind, in abusing and profaning the sabbath. How inconsistent! How absurd is such an idea? Shall infidels acknowledge an institution, vastly beneficial to society, and shall not the civil magistrate have power to protect such an institution? Shall he not have power, to suppress such conduct, as tends to corrupt the morals of our youth, and destroy the bonds of society? God has shewn us by that code of civil laws, which he gave to the Jews, that it is proper for the civil law, to punish breaches of the sabbath, as well as, breaches of any other moral precept. But the sabbath, says the objector, is between a man's conscience and his God, and it is taking away the rights of conscience, to make any human or civil laws about the sabbath. So is honesty, as much, between a man's own conscience, and his God, as the sabbath. But the objector says again, If a man breaks the sabbath, he injures himself only, but if he fraudulently takes ten or twenty shillings from his neighbour, he injures *him*, and in that case the civil law ought to punish him. Very well, But if a man breaks the sabbath, and by his example corrupts the minds of *youth*, and entices them to sin against God, and incur his displeasure, does he not do *them*

a greater injury, than if he had fraudulently taken a few shillings from them? And is not every flagrant abuse of the sabbath, an injury to society? Such objections, as many bring against the sabbath, are but too plain an evidence of the growing corruptions of the present age!

2. It is a melancholy reflection, that the sabbath is so much neglected by people in general, and so openly profaned by many individuals. How much is the house of God neglected? God hath made public worship, the business of the sabbath; and the neglect of public worship, without a reasonable excuse, is a breach of the sabbath. These things, but too plainly show, that the sabbath is a burden. Great numbers practically say, as some did of old, When will the sabbath be gone, that we may set forth wheat?

The sabbath is often profaned with unnecessary labour, or with idleness and sport, which is much worse. There is perhaps no one thing which so much manifests, that the carnal heart is enmity against God, as the neglect, and profanation of the sabbath. It is a sin of a scarlet colour, and of a crimson die. It is pointed immediately against the authority of God. On this account, God complains of his people's conduct, in neglecting his worship, and in profaning his holy day.

The excuses, which are often made, for not attending on public worship, are vain,

and unjustifiable. Some say, others who keep the day, and attend on public worship, are no better than they. Some want one article of clothing and some another. But the melancholly truth respecting all, or most of them is, they want an heart. These excuses will never answer at the bar of God. Despisers will then be stung with their own guilt. When it is too late to repent, they will tremble for their folly. "Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed me. But ye say, Wherein have we robbed thee? In tithes and in offerings. Bring ye all the tithes into the store-house that there may be meat in mine house, and prove me now herewith saith the Lord of hosts."

3. Nothing seems more strange, and unaccountable, than for professed Christians to deny the moral obligation of the sabbath; and yet this is the case with numbers, and with such too, as make high pretences to religion, who profess great love to Christ, and zeal for the advancement of his kingdom. Strange I say that they should make such professions, and yet deny, that the day on which the Saviour rose from the dead, and entered into his rest, is sanctified to his honour and glory.

Because the first day sabbath, was limited in prophecy, as a day of worship, a day to hear the *voice*, that is the *gospel* of Christ, St. Paul warned the Jews against hardness

of heart, if they did not keep the first, instead of the seventh day. But what would he now say, to those who deny the seventh and the first also? There has been scarcely any age of the church, wherein the denial of the sabbath, would not have been considered, equal to a denial of all the fundamental doctrines of our holy religion, because the *resurrection* of Christ, which the sabbath is designed to perpetuate the remembrance of, is so important, “If Christ be not *risen* then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain.”

To hear Christians say, There is no command in the New-Testament to keep the sabbath—one day is no more holy than another—a man commits no more sin, if he work on the sabbath day, than if he work on any other—or if there is a sabbath it is between God and a man’s conscience, and many other things which we frequently hear, is indeed strange! And it is equally strange, to see them lay aside their business on days allotted for labour and go several miles to a lecture or conference, and when the sabbath comes, entirely disregard it!

Doubtless God has divided the time much better than we can; but if we were to spend the other six days wholly in the duties of religion, that is no reason why we should neglect the seventh. In this God would be offended. God glorified his Son

Jesus Christ in raising him from the dead ; and the disciples of Christ are required to glorify him, by a sacred observance of the day on which he rose.

4. It highly becomes Christians to use their influence, at least by their example, to persuade others to observe this sabbath. If we are real Christians, the honour and glory of God must lie near our hearts, and also the honour and glory of Jesus Christ. And as God glorified his son Jesus Christ, in raising him from the dead, so we must glorify him by keeping the day on which he rose. Christian reader, reflect for a moment, and consider what Jesus hath done for thy soul. What infinite condescension was it for him to leave the heavenly glories to be born a helpless infant and become a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief ? When we were condemned, guilty and helpless, he appeared for our relief. What agonies did he endure in the garden ! What drops of blood did he sweat ! What reproach, what buffeting, what shame, what spitting did he suffer ! How sharp were the thorns which composed his crown ; but much sharper the pangs of grief ! He bled, he died, he made his soul an offering for sin ! His was the pain ; ours the rich reward ! He was buried, he rose again, he conquered sin and death and hell for us. He hath ceased from his work and hath entered into his

rest. There remaineth, therefore, a rest, a sabbath unto the people of God. "O come, let us worship and bow down, let us kneel before the Lord our maker. *To-day* if ye will hear his voice harden not your hearts."

Dost thou profess to be a Christian? And hast thou never found comfort from the enjoyment of the sabbath? Hast thou never been in the spirit on the Lord's day? Does not your heart pant for the courts of the Lord? Wait then at wisdom's gate, and watch at the posts of her doors. Knowledge shall feed thee, discretion shall enter into thy soul. God will bless the provisions of his house, he will satisfy the longing soul, he will fill the hungry soul with goodness. Be importuned for thine own good, for the success of religion, for the prosperity of Zion, to keep the sabbath. Let it be known that you esteem "the sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable." O Christian, if others neglect, and profane this hallowed day, "keep thyself pure, be not partaker of other men's sins." "In due time you shall reap if you faint not."



## E R R A T A.

Page.	Line.	
24.	19th	for no, read <sup>d</sup> to.
31	24th	exaftos ekaftos.
32	32d	dring. drink.
35	23d.	Internal internal <i>call only.</i>
91	8th.	they that they.
75	19th	never ever.
140	5th	Sabbatifmas Sabbatifmos.
150	14th.	ever ever used.
do.	17th	fence fense.
151	8th.	ediftions editions.
180	24th	baptifm immerfion,
204	16th.	minifter minifter and candidates.
216	18th.	apoftle apoftle <i>calls.</i>

*A few other small errors the reader will readily fee and correct.*

Table 1

Year	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
Population	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Urban	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80
Rural	70	65	60	55	50	45	40	35	30	25	20
Industrial	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60
Agriculture	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70
Services	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65
Government	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Health	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Education	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Transportation	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Communication	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Energy	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Environment	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Defense	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Other	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1960.









~~RESTRICTED CIRCULATION~~

RARE BOOKS

188225

