

y Ghost. Now it cannot be denied, that the attainment of these blessings is often predicated on repentance and faith *alone*, taken, both jointly and separately, but never once on baptism *alone*. Paul said to the Jailor, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." In this passage, and in many others that might be named, salvation is predicated on faith *alone*. And of course the same is true of repentance, inasmuch as true faith and true repentance are inseparable. And hence we read, "Repent, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." Here, the forgiveness of sins is predicated on repentance, *without* baptism. "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." In this passage spiritual life is declared to be the fruit of repentance. We might multiply quotations of this kind to almost any extent; while it is impossible to find a *single* passage in which the forgiveness of sin, or the salvation of the soul, is said to be the fruit of baptism. "Be baptized and thou shalt be saved," and, "Baptism unto life," are expressions which sound grossly unscriptural in the ears of every Bible reader. But should the word baptism be omitted in every place where it is mentioned in connection with the promise of salvation, the remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Ghost, the passages would not sound unscriptural; for such passages actually do exist, and can now be found in the Bible; while, on the other hand, should the words, "faith and repentance" be omitted in these passages, and "baptism" suffered to remain, every Bible reader would pronounce them absolutely unscriptural, for the good reason that their parallel does not exist in the Bible. We therefore conclude that baptism is not essential to the enjoyment of the blessing mentioned in those passages, viz.: "*salvation, the gift of the Holy Ghost, with the remission of sins*;" and that in reality, it has very little to do in securing all, or either of them, to any individual. And here the question very naturally arises: why is baptism named in connection with faith and repentance at all in these passages, since it is not essential to the attainment of the annexed blessings? We answer that baptism bears the same relation to repentance and faith, that the shadow does to the substance, and hence properly associated together. Faith and repentance are essential to salvation, baptism is not, yet it saves by a figure. Observe Peter's language: "The like *figure* whereunto baptism doth also now save us." Thus, according to Peter, baptism saves *only* by a figure or representation, and not in reality. And this view of the ordinance is fully corroborated by the history of Paul's conversion. When Ananias first spoke to Saul, he acknowledged him to be a Christian, and called him *brother*, stating that he had come by the direction of Christ, that he might receive his sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost. Adding, "And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." This washing Paul would of course understand to be in a figure, or representation, as he had previously experienced the reality. That baptism is *essentially representative* in its design and character, and accompanies the reality as the shadow does the substance, is further proved by the words of Christ: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." In this quotation the first proposition contains both the reality and its representative, the substance and its shadow. The second contains only the substance, the essential thing; the shadow, the representative of the reality, is dispensed with, because it always can be in such cases. Shadows are serviceable in producing in the mind a lively conception of the body and substance of the reality; yet absolute necessity deals not in shadows; it lets the shadow go, and holds fast the naked substantial reality. Of this passage before us is a beautiful illustration. Says Christ, "He that believeth not shall be damned." In further proof of the po-

sition that baptism is a representative ordinance, and has little to do in securing to any individual the remission of sins, the gift of the Holy Ghost, or true faith and repentance; we proceed to notice that the right to baptism is predicated on the *possession* of these graces. Philip said to the Ethiopian, "If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest" be baptized. Here the right to baptism is said to be the fruit of faith. "Can any man forbid water," says Peter, "that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" In this passage, the possession of the gift of the Holy Ghost is considered conclusive proof that the possessors were fully entitled to the ordinance of baptism. And as faith and the gift of the Holy Ghost include repentance and the remission of sins, it is unnecessary to produce further proof on this point. Having thus proved the REPRESENTATIVE character and design of baptism, it may be proper to state briefly some things of which we consider baptism the representative. We say some of the things, for it is evident that scripture gives to baptism great latitude in this respect. In some passages it represents the washing away of sin in the fountain of a Saviour's blood, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, &c. But we need not enumerate; nothing can be more appropriate than the declaration of the apostle: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." In this passage, baptism represents the individual as entering into a state of death to sin, (see the 11th verse,) and in the similitude of the burial and resurrection of Christ, we behold the individual entombed in the baptismal water, again to arise in the representative of his resurrection, expressive of the soul's determination to live in newness of life. Thus, baptism embraces in its representative character all that pertains to repentance and a life of faith, and hence is very properly associated with faith and repentance, although, as we have seen, it can never take the place of either, no more than the shadow can fill the place of the substance. The substance *can walk alone*, but the shadow *never*.

Having proved the Circular guilty of begging the true question at issue between us, and of building a most fallacious argument on the order of words found in scripture, and having also candidly stated, and as we judge, fully and fairly met the four strongest arguments that can be brought to bear against free communion, we now invite the reader's attention to the ERRONEOUS STATEMENTS OF THE CIRCULAR, more connectedly.

(1.) That Free Baptists agree with the Circular, in the belief that baptism is prerequisite to communion—this, as we have already showed, is not true; and to us it appears a little surprising, that the Onondaga Association have not been better informed.

(2.) The Circular says, "They," i. e. all other denominations, "are perfectly satisfied that the road we take to communion is a straight and sure road to that ordinance." Now, how can this be true, while, so far as our knowledge extends, it is, in by far the greatest number of cases, a very circuitous and crooked road. How many now in the close Baptist church, have we known to travel a whole year on the road of *prerequisite* immersion before they could reach the communion table? And how many others have labored, year after year, to reach the table by that road, and all to purpose? and need we add that the greatest part of the Christian family do not regard it as any road at all so far as they themselves are concerned? And we fearlessly take the position, that it is no more a straight road to communion, than it is to prayers. Baptism, like every other duty, should be attended to the very first opportunity, but should never be regarded as the only road to any other duty. Jesus Christ has reserv-