

to teach, or make disciples, and then, and not till then, to baptize.

With regard to the mode, the most learned men of all denominations have acknowledged that the Baptists are right. CALVIN says, "The word baptize signifies to immerse, and the right of immersion was observed" by the ancient churches. LUTHER says that "The term baptism is a Greek word; it may be rendered by dipping, as when we dip any thing in water that it may be entirely covered with water." Mr. BURKITT, a clergyman of the Established Church; Mr. JOHN WESLEY, and Dr. ADAM CLARKE, Methodists, and Dr. DOBRIEWS, an Independent, who have written comments on the Holy Scriptures, all candidly admit from Romans vi. 4, that the ancient mode of baptism was by immersion, and the celebrated Dr. CHAMBERS says, with regard to the same passage, in his Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, "We doubt not the prevalent style of administration in the apostles days, was by actually submerging the whole body under water!"

Thus I have sought plainly to set the truth before you, and trusting you will "search the scriptures" for yourselves, I doubt not you will be led to a right conclusion as to truth and duty on this important subject. I will only add, that although you have no authority from the word of God for baptizing unconverted children, you have sufficient direction respecting the manner in which you should seek their spiritual welfare, and for this Baptists are not less concerned than others.

It is true we do not believe that sprinkling an infant can make it (as the Prayer-book teaches), "a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven," for that saving change can only be effected by the Holy Spirit; neither are we in doubt when our infants die, respecting their everlasting happiness. We weep as parents over their sleeping dust, but we believe that the souls of all dying in infancy, are among the chosen and redeemed of the Lord, and will dwell for ever; because he hath said, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven."

We also feel it our duty both by example and instruction, if our children are spared to years of understanding, to "train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." We do not trust to an outward ceremony of man's invention, but we pray for them, that the Holy Spirit may renew their souls, and lead them to that Saviour who has said, "I love them that love me, and those that seek me early shall find me." O that you may seek first, if you have not yet done so, the salvation of your own souls, and then have the happiness of seeing your children savingly converted to God, scripturally baptized, united to the visible church of Christ, and at last received with yourselves into the fold above.

Let us blend a spirit of holy love towards all who love the Saviour, with an uncompromising firmness of Christian principle; and so "Speak the truth in love, that we may grow up unto him in all things, who is the head, even Christ."—Eph. iv. 15.

I am your Servant in the Gospel,
CORNELIUS ELVEN.

[FOR THE CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.]

Under head II., (No. iii.) he quotes Isa. lxxv. 17; xxxv. 1; lx. 3, and iv. 13., as a prediction of the renovation of the earth, in the millennium. There is, however, as much warrant from the lx. (ib.) to expect that "the ships of Tarshish" shall be employed in bringing the sons of Zion together with "gold and silver unto the name of Jehovah;" that the rams of Neboth shall come up literally, with acceptance upon his altar; nay, more, that the people of God shall suck the milk of the Gentiles, and draw the breasts of kings. This must necessarily be admitted by the author, according to his avowed sentiments, particularly that of "receiving all that the Spirit teaches as literally true." The Spirit teaches that the breasts of kings are to be sucked in the millennium, is it to be viewed as literally true?

From Isa. lxxv. 17, 25, he traces "the following particulars of the state of things, during the thousand years."

1. "The empire of death will be abridged, and probably, except in cases of forfeiture by transgression, will be taken away altogether." This, let it be remembered, is to be preceded by the resurrection; if then the living shall be changed, and the dead raised incorruptible, how can there be death any more among the saints? and the theory excludes the existence of the wicked, or admits and denies it at the same time. It is no doubt perplexing to the author, "the child shall die an hundred years old," even "during the thousand years." Then there is to be death still, and also "sinners" a hundred years old and "cursed."

2. "Men shall dwell peacefully in settled homes," &c. In what capacity we are left to conjecture. There shall be no marriage after the resurrection, saints in this respect are to be similar to the angels: (Luke xx. 36.; Matt. xxii. 30) still, "men are to dwell in settled homes, and enjoy the fruit of their labours." If the risen bodies of the saints shall not be natural-*animal*, but spiritual, what evidence can the author adduce, that they will depend upon food, sleep, rest, breath, &c., as means of existence? Adam, even before his transgression, was "of the earth" therefore "earthly;" but the saints are destined to bear the image of "the last Adam, the Lord from heaven."

3. "The voice of weeping shall be no more heard." If life shall be forfeited by transgression, there shall be evils enough to cause sorrow and weeping.

4. "Answer to prayer will be direct and immediate." If prayer will be necessary after the resurrection, why not for ever?

5. "The lower animals shall be divested of every savage propensity," &c. Then it follows that the lion, the conformation and nature of which is proclaccous, "will eat straw like the bullock." It is not the fall of Adam which made the lion so different from the lamb, but the creative wisdom of God. To give him new and opposite propensities, with his present conformation, would be a contradiction in nature.

Under head III., he introduces the first resurrection; urges its necessity in order that "the saints may take and possess the kingdom and reign with Christ." He regards it as settled, that to this resurrection St. Paul refers, in the words, "that I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead;" "literally," he adds, "the resurrection

out from amongst the dead." As much stress is laid on this expression, it may be well to examine it; the whole passage referred to reads thus, "οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν ἐκστασία τῶν νεκρῶν." If somehow I should attain to the resurrection out of the dead. Here is as literal a version as he can give. Now, admitting that the idea attachable to the particle *ek*, here, (*out of*) is *out from*, the meaning is not "out from amongst the dead;" but *out of*, or *out from*, the state, the regions, or the mansions of the dead. But this particle, like some others, is often used in composition intensively. Compare *erethizein* (to irritate), with *exerethizein* (to irritate exceedingly). In instances, its presence or absence is scarcely traceable. Compare *creipoo*, with *exeripoo*. In others, it adds the idea of *up to the term* with which it is compounded. Thus, *exantistemi*, the verb of the substantive, is used, as *kai exantistese sperma*, &c., and *raise up seed*, &c. In Rom. i. 4, these terms stand separately, i.e., uncompounded, *ex anastaseos*, when it will not be contended even by the most strenuous proto-anastasists, that there is any allusion to the resurrection which they advocate.

In the third paper on the first resurrection, it is said, "Not the resurrection of the dead generally—that is no privilege, all will share it—but the resurrection from amongst the dead, taken apart from the whole." If being left in the state of the dead a thousand years longer, would be an infliction of dire punishment upon the wicked, how much more would periods of five or six thousand years increase it? such as have passed over the grave of righteous Abel. Thousands of years death has reigned over the cave of Machpelah, and the unfrequented grave of him who heaved his last sigh on the top of Nebo—over the dust of those dear to God. But, to return, does the event referred to in Romans, express in part, by the terms *ex anastaseos*, warrant the theory of "taking a part from the whole?" It is the expression which the apostle uses to state the solitary resurrection of the Saviour. The fact is, to rise from the dead, and the resurrection, are expressed simply by the terms, *egeirai* and *egerais*. What difference does Paul intend in the following passage? *Ode theos kai ton Kurion egeire kai oemus egerais;* &c. Does he mean to say that God merely raised up Christ, but that he will raise believers "out from amongst the dead?" Does he not rather mean to say, that the God who raised Christ will also raise his saints by the same power? "This form of expression" may be "defended by Cunningham," and considered forcible by "men who have a system to defend," but from what we have seen, without warrant. The fact is, the advocates of the first resurrection, are at a loss to find proof for it any where in scripture. Let the quotation from the late Rev. Edward Bickersteth, given in the essay on "the first resurrection," suffice as an instance. At present, let us look at the remarks on the first Psalm, fifth verse, "Therefore the ungodly shall not stand (rise again) in the judgment," "The word *stand* is, in the original, *ris* again. With due deference to that late author, the word *stand* in the original is not "rise again." That word (*kum*) has no such meaning? and to convey the idea of *again*, some other term, as *yasaph*, *shannah*, *ad*, &c., must be added. The writer is aware, that this term is sometimes rendered *rise again*, when the *subject* suggests this idea; but still the idea is not contained in the term itself. See Ex. xxi. 19; Deut. xxxiii. 11; Is. xxiv. 20. Its primary meaning, is to *rise*; but it is used often in the sense of *to stand, confirm, verify*, &c. There is no reference either to the *first or last* resurrection in the first psalm. If this be thought too dogmatical, the writer promises to retract it, when he is convicted of error.

In taking up this question, it will suffice to examine two passages, which are, "The First Resurrection," and "The dead in Christ shall rise first;" being the strongest that can be adduced. The first resurrection is here predicated of martyrs only—"those beheaded for the witness of Jesus."