

1. There was a plurality of Sabbaths as well as baptisms under the Old Testament. The great festivals of the Jews were Sabbaths, for on them they were forbidden to do any servile work (Lev. xix. 3, 30). The first and the tenth day of the seventh month are each of them expressly called a Sabbath (Lev. xxiii. 24, 32).

2. Paul insinuates the abolition of both under the New Testament. The former in Col. ii. 16, 17, "Let no man judge you in meat or drink or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon or of the Sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come." The latter in Heb. ix. 10, "Divers baptisms and carnal ordinances imposed on them until the time of reformation."

3. This abolition does not prevent the continuance of one Sabbath and of one baptism until the end of time. One of each is still enjoyed by the Church.

4. At the resurrection of our Saviour the Sabbath underwent changes corresponding to those in baptism respecting its occasion, materials and other things. The Sabbath now commemorates the resurrection of Christ rather than the finishing of the work of creation, and it is translated from the last to the first day of the week. It is not now devoted to offering of double sacrifices and other Old Testament services, but to New Testament preaching, prayers, sacraments, &c.

I conclude then that, with all its alterations, baptism is still the same in substance that it was in the days of Moses; and that by these alterations it is reformed and perfected so as completely to suit the more simple and spiritual worship of the New Testament. The rite is rendered as simple and easy as possible, much more so than immersion, which bears a strange resemblance to the unreformed and burdensome services of the Old Testament which the wisdom of God saw meet to abolish.

When baptism is extended to the Gentiles a plain commission is given for that purpose, and a plain direction how to make them subjects: "Go ye therefore and disciple all nations, baptizing them." There is no direction here about the mode; for there is no new mode of baptism for the Gentiles, though they are new subjects. They had not been included in any baptism of Moses, or of John or of Christ. These three were of one extent. Even Christ said to his Apostles, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles." The middle wall of partition made them strangers and foreigners till after the death of Christ. How admirable is the wisdom of our Saviour in suiting his institutions to the need of his Church! Without this direction the Apostles could not know how to proceed in the case of the Gentiles; with it their way is plain, for Gentiles by becoming disciples become at once the seed of Abraham; while the great body of his lineal descendants, by rejecting the counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized of the Gentiles, became aliens.

Comparing Isaiah's prophecy of the extension of baptism with its accomplishment by means of Christ's commission I cannot but admire how beautifully the latter accords with, yet surpasses, the former. "He shall sprinkle *many* nations," said the prophet; "Disciple *all* nations, baptize them," said the Saviour. But does baptizing all nations imply infant baptism? Most clearly. The Apostles could understand it in no other sense, for this plain reason, that in their own nation baptism had uniformly included infants ever since the days of Moses. Had the commission been "circumcising the nations" it would have readily been understood as including them, though males only were circumcised, and these but once, much more baptizing the nations,