

tion to you. You understood him to send you forth to disciple the nations and baptize them with *water*; whereas, what he meant was, that you should not use *water* at all, but baptize them with the Holy Ghost." Can you imagine, I say, anything more curious, I might almost say more ludicrous, than a scene like this? And yet we have the substance of the thing whenever the claim is advanced by any set of men and for whatever end, that *they* understand the utterances of Christ better than the Apostles did.

4. The fourth assumption alluded to as involved in the scheme is, that *the example of the Apostles in this matter is not of necessity binding upon us*; and the fact of their baptizing with water, does not establish our obligation to conform to this usage. That the Apostles might have observed some customs which are not obligatory upon us, may be conceded without affecting the present question. This question is as specific as it is important. Our Saviour gave a command respecting baptism, which, it is admitted by all, is of perpetual obligation. Did he, in this command, contemplate water baptism? We examine, in the first place, the proper meaning of the words and phrases he employs, and are satisfied that what he enjoined was water baptism. We turn, then, to those upon whom he laid the command, and who had a deeper stake in ascertaining its import than any other human beings; and we find that they and their contemporaries, without exception (in so far as the annals of that day have come down to us), interpreted his words of water baptism. Under these circumstances, and contemplating their example in this aspect, we maintain that we are bound to conform to the usage they initiated, that we must interpret and obey the command as they did.

And here we rest the argument, to show that our Saviour instituted baptism with water as an ordinance of perpetual obligation in his Church; and that no man nor sect may lawfully annul, disparage, or neglect it, on the ground that the present is a spiritual dispensation, and that God will be worshipped "in spirit and in truth."

The same train of argument so obviously applies to the command respecting the *Eucharist*, that it would be superfluous to traverse the ground a second time in presenting it. There is one fact, however, of too much significance to be omitted here. These two ordinances, it is claimed, were part and parcel of the Mosaic economy, and, as such, were not designed to be perpetuated under the Christian dispensation. And yet, the institution of the Lord's Supper was made the subject of a special revelation to the Apostle Paul, *after the Saviour's ascension*. (See 1 Cor. 11: 23.) "*For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread,*" &c. It will not be denied that the new dispensation had commenced some time before this communication was made. How inexplicable, then, on the theory we are opposing, that the Saviour should have revealed to his apostle all these particulars respecting the institution of a rite which was not intended to be handed down to after-times; and how mysterious that this very apostle should have been left under the *illusion* that the churches were on no account to neglect the due observance of this ordinance; and that he must carefully instruct them to celebrate it. Can any one believe that this was an "illusion?" and if so, can you assign any motive for the revelation?

To urge, in reply to all this, that living as we do under a spiritual dispensation, we do not need the aid of these ordinances, is a plea altogether inadmissible. Where God has spoken, as He has in this case, there is an end to argument and speculation. However undesigned, there is great presumption in saying that we do not require rites which He has seen fit to prescribe for our observance. We could have no right to take this ground, even though we might not be able to trace the connection between these ordinances and the ends proposed to be