

children's bread. What do you say to this? I am aware that some mistake our views, and some wilfully misrepresent them. The following remarks are intended to prevent mistakes. Under the Old Testament God provided a way to procure pardon for sins, and this way was so clear that the sinner could easily know when he was pardoned. It would be incredible to suppose that the way of procuring pardon should be so very clear under the dark shadowy dispensation, and dark under the noonday light of the Gospel. In the 4th and 5th chapters of Leviticus we have a directory how persons in different stations in life were to procure pardon when they sinned and were *guilty*, and when the guilty person complied with every punctilio in the directory, he had the promise of pardon. No person in that age could be at any loss how to obtain pardon when *conscious of guilt*; and there can be no doubt but the confusion of speech that is abroad in our day is owing to erroneous teaching about the way of obtaining pardon. Let us now take one of the examples recorded in Leviticus—say one of the common people (Lev iv 27). He has done something against the commandments of the Lord. How is he to obtain pardon? He is to bring a kid of the goats, a female. Clear directions are given how to offer it, and if the directions are not followed up, if, for instance, the guilty person bring a *male* instead of a *female*, or if he lay his hand on the *rump* instead of the *head*, the direction in that particular is departed from; and in that case there would be no certain promise of pardon; but the reverse. But there was no virtue in following up these directions to *procure pardon*, any further than it was the ordinance of God to *extend pardon* to the guilty person. Nevertheless the guilty person had no promise of pardon in any other way. In like manner the ordinance of baptism is God's ordinance to extend pardon (for past sins). Let us now look at Naaman the Syrian. He was afflicted with leprosy. From information received, he came to the land of Israel to be healed of his leprosy. He had in his mind a way through which he expected to be healed (2nd Kings v), and when he saw that the direction of the prophet opposed his notions, he turned away in a rage. Through the advice of his servants, he resolved to comply with the direction of the Prophet. He goes down to Jordan, dips himself once, twice, three, four times, five times; his leprosy still cleaves to him, and if he had even then gone away, he would have gone away a *rebel*. But when he dips himself the *seventh time, according to the saying of the man of God, he was healed*. But there was no *virtue* to heal the leprosy in Jordan, more than in Abana or Pharpar; neither was there any virtue in the seventh dip more than in the six which preceded it. The virtue lay entirely in doing what God, by his prophet, commanded. Just so in baptism. In our day, multitudes, like Naaman, have a way of their own, through which they expect to obtain pardon; and when they see that God's way does not accord with their notions, they reject it with scorn. Another error with Naaman was, that he imagined the virtue to be in the *water*; so we are also asked if water will wash away sins? We answer, No; but God can wash away sins in water, and we are willing to receive the remission of our sins *just where he is pleased to grant it*. We read of the Lord Jesus giving sight to