

of repentance for *the remission of sins*, (Mark i 4, Luke iii 3). Peter does the same (Acts ii, 38). I now ask if those addressed by Peter had replied and said that they repented and believed, and had no need to be baptized for the remission of sins, because their sins were already pardoned when they repented and believed, refusing to obey the *divine command* (be baptized every one of you), would Peter acknowledge them as believers and pardoned persons? I think not. The case of Saul of Tarsus (in my opinion) completely overturns your views and proves mine. Did not Saul believe when the Lord spoke to him on the way to Damascus? Did he repent during the three days and three nights he fasted and prayed at Damascus? Were his sins pardoned? The answer is, No: for Ananias says to him, Why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, (Acts xx 16). Why was not Saul's sins remitted or washed away when he believed and repented? Because he had not yet come to God's appointed place to receive the remission of his sins.

What do you say to the words of the Apostle Peter (1st Peter iii 21)? Baptism now saves us (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience). It is not *filth* from the flesh that baptism puts away; but *guilt* from the conscience. I ask if the person that refuses to obey the *divine command* (Be baptized every one of you) can have a good conscience?

I am afraid you will be thinking by this time that I am making too much of baptism. I ask, am I making any more of it than the scriptures make of it. If so, show me in what particular. You said in your letter that the believer's sins are washed in the blood of Christ. Very good. It is also said, Be baptized and wash away thy sins. The two passages are in perfect harmony with each other.—The shedding of the blood of Christ is the *procuring cause* of pardon or remission of sins; baptism is only the means of enjoying this pardon—baptism being God's appointed means for bringing the sinner in connection with the *virtue* of the blood of Christ. Washed in the blood of Christ, and washed in baptism are not to be understood literally but figuratively. Blood may stain, but cannot literally wash. There is no literal contact of the sinner with the literal blood of Christ; neither is there any literal washing of sins in baptism. In both cases the language is to be understood figuratively. Now you will observe that I am not saying that no person can be saved without baptism. I am saying no such thing. It is not for us to say what God may do or not do. We know his mercies are very great. What God may do is one thing; and what he has promised to do is another thing; and it is on what he has promised to do that we can depend. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved (Mark xvi 16). Those who say that the sinner passes from the unpardoned to the pardoned state when he believes and repents, ought to be consistent with themselves. Surely those who are pardoned are the children of God, and entitled to the privilege of children. Why then do the generality of the Baptists refuse the children to partake of the children's bread. There appears to me to be a manifest inconsistency in this—to refuse the children of God, to partake of the