

latter commands is obviously indispensable, so is our compliance with the former equally so. Now, though I should grant that the direction of our Lord to baptize meant to have recourse to water; and though I thus should classify it with the Lord's supper; yet I would maintain that the commands for the observance of both *ceremonies* were of a nature *simply positive*, and consequently not of *perpetual* obligation. A merely *positive* precept has no connexion with the *unchangeable* "spiritual" law of God, and does nothing more than enjoin for some *specific* purpose a practice to itself independent. For instance, the ten commandments are moral in their nature, respecting love to God and man, leading to peace and happiness here and to glory hereafter. And such are the commands to pray, believe, repent, &c. And such belong to that unchangeable law of God, which, when revealed, demands the obedience of *all* men at *all* times. But a merely *positive* command appears to contain no evident *eternal* evidence of its being binding; as it may concern a point that to whom it was actually addressed, and to those who were placed under the *same peculiar circumstances*. For example, let us take the command given to the leper in Mark. viii. 4, to "offer the gift that Moses commanded." Though this command was given by the same Almighty Lord, Jesus, who commanded that men should believe, &c. yet as not belonging to the *eternal* law, but to the *ceremonial* law, like the sacraments, it was not to be *perpetual*. St. Paul's example of a command with the ceremonial law in the discourse already mentioned, is a striking instance of this. He referred to the leper as *identical* with the man who offered the sacrifice of the golden altar, and his conscience accused him of being guilty of neglecting his sacrifice to the priest. "and to lay his hands on the head and to offer his sins over it: after this his life was to be taken away, and he was to be offered in stead of the sinner's life. And this was to be done, even when a man believed it through ignorance. But in what did Christ's blood take away sin? His blood take away sin? No. It was not possible for blood of bulls and of goats should do that. The sacrifice was only a symbolical picture to bring the Messiah into mind, as if he had said, 'As this is a picture of my own offering in every sacrifice the Father sees it as of the Father of God; and believers did remember him. When they ate of the paschal lamb, they discerned the Lord's body, and enjoyed communion with Christ, our Jesus, even as we do now at the Lord's supper. They found him present in the ordinances, according to his most true promise in the text. *Until the day dawn, &c.* as he, the great day of my appearing in the flesh, and the shadows flee away," the shadows of the ceremonial law he recalled and fulfilled in my life, obedience, sufferings, death, resurrection, and ascension: *until these things be*, I will be spiritually present upon mount Moriah, in the temple worship, and upon the hill of frankincense, to render the persons and the services of my people well-pleasing and acceptable unto God the Father."

The intelligent reader's mind can see from the foregoing remarks how that sacraments are *confessedly* *repugnant* and inconsistent with the Gospel Church