



# THE CHRISTIAN.

VOL. IV. } SAINT JOHN, N. B., SEPTEMBER 1848. { No. 9.

CONDUCTED BY W. W. EATON.

Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God.—*Peter.* On this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.—*The Lord Messiah.*

## RESTORATION OF THE ANCIENT, ORDER OF THINGS.

No. IX.

### ON THE BREAKING OF BREAD—No. IV.

I do not aim at prolixity, but at brevity, in discussing the various topics which are necessary to be introduced into this work. We are not desirous to shew how much may be said on this or any other subject, but to shew how little is necessary to establish the truth, and to say much in a few words. We shall not, then, dwell any longer on the scriptural authority for the weekly breaking of bread; but for the sake of those who are startled at what they call innovation, we shall adduce a few historical facts and incidents. We lay no stress upon what is no better than the traditions of the church, or upon the testimony of those called the *primitive* fathers, in settling any part of christian worship or christian obedience. Yet, when the scriptures are explicit upon any topic which is lost sight of in modern times, it is both gratifying and useful to know how the practice has been laid aside and other customs been substituted in its room. There is, too, a corroborating influence in authentic history, which, while it does not authorize any thing as of divine authority, it confirms the conviction of our duty in things divinely established, by observing how they were observed and how they were laid aside.

All antiquity concurs in evincing that for the three first centuries all the churches broke bread once a week. Pliny, in his Epistles, book 10th; Justin Martyr, in his Second Apology for the Christians; and Tertullian, De Ora. p. 135, testify that it was the universal practice in all the weekly assemblies of the brethren, after they had prayed and sang praises—"then bread and wine being brought to the chief brother, he takes it and offers praise and thanksgiving to the Father, in the name of the Son and the Holy Spirit. After prayer and thanksgiving the whole assembly says, Amen. When thanksgiving is ended by the chief guide, and the consent of the whole people, the deacons (as we call them) give to every one present part of the bread and wine, over which thanks are given."

The weekly communion was preserved in the Greek church till the seventh century; and, by one of their canons, "such as neglected three

weeks together were excommunicated."—*Erskine's Dissertations*, p. 271.

In the fourth century, when all things began to be changed by baptized Pagans, the practice began to decline. Some of the councils in the western part of the Roman empire, by their canons, strove to keep it up. The council held at Illiberis in Spain, A. D. 324, decreed that "no offerings should be received from such as did not receive the Lord's Supper."—*Council Illi. canon 28.*

The council at Antioch, A. D. 341, decreed that "all who came to church, and heard the scriptures read, but afterwards joined not in prayer, and receiving the sacrament, should be cast out of the church till such time as they gave public proof of their repentance."—*Council Ant. canon 2.*

All these canons were unable to keep a carnal crowd of professors in a practice for which they had no spiritual taste; and, indeed, it was likely to get out of use altogether. To prevent this, the council of Agatha, in Languedoc, A. D. 506, decreed "that none should be esteemed good christians who did not *communicate* at least three times a year—at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsunday." *Coun. Agatha, canon 18.* This soon became the standard of a good christian, and it was judged presumptuous to commune oftener.

Things went on in this way for more than six hundred years, until they got tired of even *three* communications in one year; and the infamous council of Lateran, which decreed auricular confession and transubstantiation, decreed that "an annual communion at Easter was sufficient." This association of the "sacrament" with Easter, and the mechanical devotion of the ignorant at this season, greatly contributed to the worship of the Host. *Bingham's Ori. B.* 15, c. 9. Thus the breaking of bread in simplicity and godly sincerity once a week, degenerated into a pompous sacrament once a year at Easter.

At the Reformation this subject was but slightly investigated by the reformers. Some of them, however, paid some attention to it. Even Calvin, in his *Ins. Lib.* 4, chap. 17, 46, says:—"And truly this custom, which enjoins communicating once a year, is a most evident contrivance of the Devil, by whose instrumentality soever it may have been determined."

And again, (*Ins. Lib.* 6 chap. xviii. sec. 46:) he says:—"It ought to have been far otherwise. Every week, at least, the table of the Lord should have been spread for christian assemblies, and the promises declared, by which, in partaking of it, we might be spiritually fed."

Martin Chemnitz, Witsius, Calderwood, and others of the reformers and controversialists, concur with Calvin; and, indeed, almost every commentator on the New Testament, concurs with the Presbyterian Henry in these remarks on Acts xx. 7. "In the primitive times it was the custom of many churches to receive the Lord's Supper every Lord's day."

The Belgic reformed church, in 1581, appointed the supper to be received every other month. The reformed churches of France, after saying that they had been too remiss in observing the supper but four times a year, advise a greater frequency. The church of Scotland be-

gan with four sacraments in a year ; but some of her ministers got up to twelve times. Thus things stood till the close of the last century.

Since the commencement of the present century, many congregations in England, Scotland, Ireland, and some in the United States and Canada, both Independents and Baptists, have attended upon the supper every Lord's day, and the practice is every day gaining ground.

These historical notices may be of some use to those who are ever and anon crying out *Innovation ! Innovation !* But we advocate the principle and the practice on apostolic grounds alone. Blessed is that servant who, knowing his master's will, does it with expedition and delight.

Those who would wish to see an able refutation of the Presbyterian mode of observing the sacrament, and a defence of weekly communion, would do well to read Dr. John Mason's letters on frequent Communion, who is himself a high-toned Presbyterian, and, consequently, his remarks will be more regarded by his brethren than mine.

A. C.

### CHRISTIAN PERFECTION.

THIS high attainment is not only desirable, but absolutely necessary to qualify every obedient believer for the enjoyment of that felicity that is to be realized in the presence of God, beyond the confines of the dark and silent tomb. And God, who is rich in mercy, has in a most wonderful manner displayed his divine benevolence in the person of our most gracious Redeemer for the accomplishment of this grand object, in his descent to this earth and in his ascension "far above all heavens." And after this wondrous display of divine compassion, he proceeds (through the descent of the Holy Spirit) to lay a sure foundation by which we may with the greatest certainty "come to the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a *perfect* man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." Again, the apostle Paul referring to this sublime subject, says, "Whom we preach, *warning* every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man *perfect* in Christ Jesus." Col. i. 28. As soon, therefore, as we arrive to this spiritual position, all scruples and doubts respecting our acceptance in the sight of God disappear at once. It may be asked, by what means or through what process can mortals in this state of being possibly arise to a complete state of christian perfection? We will endeavor to give the answer after a few remarks. Noah, Job, and Hezekiah, and a host of the ancient patriarchs and prophets—called "a cloud of witnesses," Heb. xii. 1—came to that state of perfection required of them as servants of the Most High: hence, Peter calls them "holy men of old;" and no doubt but David had seen some of those perfect ones, for he says "Mark the *perfect* man and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace." Psalm xxxvii. 37. Christian reader, have you enlisted in the ranks of the King of kings, and are you advancing towards this highly desirable state of christian perfection, so as to rise superior and above every species of *secular* prejudice and party spirit? or any thing else that is beneath the dignity of christianity? But, again, you are ready to inquire, how shall the believer in Christ arrive at this state of holy living before his God and before the world of mankind? Well

according to the *rule* of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, the believer can with the fullest assurance arrive with perfect safety to this most desirable attainment. The apostle Peter speaks thus, "According as his divine power hath given unto us *all things* that pertain unto *life and godliness.*" Mark, it is here stated that, *all things* are given to *us* (every believer or true christian) that belong to these admirable qualifications. "Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises; that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature. And besides this (that is, besides being partakers of the divine nature), giving all diligence, add to your faith, virtue." Let your moral goodness and chasity be pure and unimpeachable. "And to virtue, knowledge." Be skilful and intelligent in the law of the spirit of life. "And to knowledge, temperance." Let your moderation and sedateness run commensurate with your christian character and outward deportment. "And to temperance, patience." Be calm and resigned in the midst of severe affliction, endure reproach and opposition with much long suffering. "And to patience, godliness." Continue piously and righteously toward God. "And to godliness, brotherly kindness." Be very strict in carrying out the nature, principle, and quality of this grace, so as to exemplify all the fruits of a heaven born soul. "And to brotherly kindness, charity." Suffer long, and be kind, envy no one, nor be puffed up; do not behave yourself unseemly; seek not your own; be not easily provoked; think no evil; rejoice not in iniquity, but rejoice in the truth; bear all things, believe all things, hope for all things, endure all things. "For if these things be in you and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ." 2 Pet. i. 1—8. "And this is life eternal, that they might *know* thee, the only *true* God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." The apostle Peter goes on to say, "For if ye do these things ye shall never fall. For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." A thorough knowledge of God and his Son Jesus Christ, and a complete submission on our part to all things taught by Christ and his Apostles brings us to this excellent state of holy living. And this holy living brings us (at the resurrection of the just) to the tree of life, in the everlasting kingdom.

CONDONO.

**SPIRIT OF RELIGION.**—Christ re-established the unity of human nature. He taught us the principle of eternal justice, and the grand secret of all harmony and happiness, on earth as in heaven—love. Till we arrive at that point of his system, we are unacquainted with Christianity, and are ignorant of our natures and our destinies. The dogmas and the mysteries that even the very highest disciples have wrapped round this glorious sun of the Christian system—this all-embracing sentiment of universal love, have only obscured its light from us, and screened from us its vital warmth. The gospel does not consist in doctrines and ceremonies [only], but in love.

But to love we must know who are worthy of our love; and here again the revelation of Christ embraced the infinite: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." And then came the question, "who is thy neighbor?" And the answer expressed in an immortal story was, "Every one who needs thy help."—*Extract.*

## LECTURES TO CHILDREN.

BY JOHN TODD.

## LECTURE III.

## ANGELS' JOY WHEN SINNERS REPENT.

There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.—  
LUKE xv. 10.

DID any of these children ever see an angel? No. Did I ever see one? No. Did ever any body see an angel? Yes. A great many have. Abraham did. Lot did. David did. Christ did. Peter and John did. And in the Bible you read of many who have seen angels.

But though you never *saw* an angel, yet you all know what an angel is. Angels are good spirits, who love God more than they love one another, and more than they love any thing else. They live in heaven. And what do you think they are doing there? Idle, do you think? No. They are never idle a moment. Sometimes God sends them away on errands, just as your parents send you. Sometimes they come down to this world to do good to good people here. When a good man dies, they stand by his bed, and carry his soul up to heaven, just as you are led by the hand when you do not know the way.

And though we cannot see them, yet I suppose some are here in this meeting-house now, seeing you and me, and looking to see if this sermon will do any good. What else do they do? Why, if God has no errands on which to send them, then they sing his praises, and make music a thousand times sweeter than any which we ever heard.

There are a great many of these angels in heaven—more than this house would hold,—more than a thousand or a million of such meeting houses would hold, if they were all to be seated just as you are. And they are all happy. Because not one of them ever did wrong; not one ever spake a cross or a wicked word; not one of them ever told a lie; not one of them ever sinned, or ever felt any kind of pain. And, what is very wonderful, they love us. They come down here, and when any body repents of sin, they tell of it in heaven, and they all rejoice and are glad. Now, just read this beautiful text again. “I say unto you, There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.” Now, if I had told you this without first finding it in God’s book, you could not have believed me. But now we know it *must* be so, because Christ hath told us so; and he says, “Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.”

I wish, now, my dear children, to tell you two plain reasons why the angels rejoice over every sinner who repents. I could give you many more reasons, but am afraid you cannot remember more.

1. First, then, they rejoice when any one repents, because *they know what heaven and hell are.*

Now, suppose, I had never seen any one of you before; and I should ask one of these little boys or girls about their home. You could tell me about it—where you eat, where you sleep, where you play, how you are kept warm in the cold weather,—how your parents take good care of you,—where you go to school,—how many ways your parents take to make you happy. You could tell me all about your home, and your

garden and all your pleasant things there, *because you have always lived there.*

Just so of the angels. They have always lived in heaven, and know how pleasant a place it is. And when any one repents, they know he will go to heaven, and be happy as they are. They have talked with good old Noah about the wicked world that was drowned in the flood, when he

“Humble, happy saint,  
Surrounded with his chosen few,  
Sat in the ark, secure from fear,  
And sang the grace that steered him through!”

They have talked with Abraham, and Joseph, and David, and Paul, and all the happy men in heaven; and they know that they are all happy, and so they rejoice when any one repents and sets out to go to heaven.

Suppose you were to see a poor ragged boy, almost frozen with the cold, and who has no home, and no fire to warm him by, and no food to eat, and no bed to sleep on, and no friends to take care of him; now, would you not be glad to have some kind man to take that poor child in, and give him a home like yours? Yes. I know you would—I know you would, because you know what it is to have a pleasant home. Well, just so the blessed angels feel when any one repents, for they know God will take him to heaven.

Children, what would you let any one take some heavy tool and crush your finger for? For a dollar? No. For ten? No. But what would you have your arm cut off for? For a hundred dollars? No. For all the playthings in the whole world? No. For how much would you lose your *reason*, and be crazy? For any thing in this world? No. I know you would not. For how much would you have your eyes put out, so that you could never again see your friends, nor the beautiful light of the glorious sun? Not for all the world. But, my dear children, the man who goes to hell because he will not repent of sin, is worse off than if he were to lose an arm, or his eyes; yes, worse off than if he were to lose his reason, or be put into the fire, and kept burning all day and all night, and a year, and ten thousand years. For he loses his soul, and has not a friend in heaven, nor any where else; and, what is more, he never will have a friend. He is “covered with shame and everlasting contempt.” The holy angels know all this, and rejoice when any sinner repents, and thus escapes the punishment of hell.

This is the first reason. Can you remember it?

2. The second reason why angels rejoice over a sinner who repents, is, that *till he does repent, it is very uncertain whether he ever will.*

If one of you were sick, and laid on the bed, and were so sick that it was very uncertain whether you would live or die, your parents and friends would feel very anxious about you. They would come to your bed side, and raise up your feeble head, and inquire about your pain, and send off for the physician, and would sit up with you all night. Yes, and they would think more about their sick child, and feel more anxious about you, than about all the rest of the family, so long as it was uncertain whether or not you got well. And just so the angels feel, so long as it is uncertain whether or not a sinner repents.

Turn now to the 12th chapter of 2d Samuel, and see if David did not feel just so. As long as it was uncertain whether his child should live or die, he lay on the ground, and fasted and prayed. This uncertainty made him feel very anxious.

Suppose one of your little brothers should fall into the river, and there sink down under the deep waters, and before he could be got out, he should grow cold and pale, and seem to be dead. Your father takes the little boy in his arms, and carries him home, and then they wrap him up in warm flannels, and lay him up on the bed. The doctor comes, and goes into the room with your father and mother, to see if it is possible to save the little boy's life. The doctor says that nobody may go into the room but the parents. They go in, and shut the door, and in a few minutes the question is to be decided, whether or not the child can live. Oh, then, how would you go to the door, and walk around with a step soft as velvet, and hearken to know whether the dear boy lives! And after you had listened for some time, treading softly, and speaking in whispers, and breathing short, the door opens, and your mother comes out, and there are tears in her eyes! Is he dead?—says one in a faint, sinking whisper—is he dead? Oh, no—no—your little brother lives, and will be well again! Oh, what a thrill of joy do you all feel! What leaping up in gladness! Now, there is such a joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth. The sinner has been sick, but the gospel has been taken as the remedy, and he is to live for ever. Do you wonder that the angels rejoice at it?

Just turn to the 21st chapter of Numbers, and read the account of the healing of those who had been bitten by the fiery serpents. Had you been there, you might have seen parents carrying their little children who had been bitten, and who were just ready to die. The poison of the serpents is circulating through them, and they are almost gone. The mother brings up her child to the brazen serpent. Oh, how anxious is she, lest it has not got strength sufficient to look up! How tenderly does she gaze upon its face, as she holds it up to the brazen serpent, waiting for it to open its eyes! and what joy when it does look up and live! So there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.

I have now told you the two reasons why the holy angels rejoice when a sinner repents. I next wish you to hear *three* remarks. Will you remember them—all three?

1. *Most men are not like the holy angels.*

By being *like* the angels, I do not mean, that most men do not *look* like them; for nobody looks like them. But I mean that they do not *feel* like them. You hear men talk every day. What do they talk about? Why, about the weather, their health, their cattle, their crops, and their neighbours; but very few say any thing about the repentance of sinners.

Suppose one of you should repent to day. I should be glad, and so would some others; but the greater part of the people in this town would know nothing about it; or if they did, they would care nothing about it. Not so with the angels. They would all rejoice over it—would all know it.



Suppose one of you should find a piece of gold as you go home as big as your fist. What a wonder! All the town would know of it, and talk about it, and call you a lucky child; but the angels would care nothing about it—no, not if you should find gold enough to fill this house. You see why. Because they feel for your *soul*, while most men think only of the world. And the reason is, men are sinners, and most of them love any thing better than repentance. If any one of you should repent to day, I suppose many would laugh and sneer at it. But not an angel in heaven would laugh or sneer. You see, then, how it is, that the first remark is true, that most men are not like the holy angels.

2. My second remark is, *that we cannot go to heaven without repenting of sin.*

If a man could go to heaven without repenting of sin, then nobody would need to repent; and if any one did repent, he would be doing what was not needful. And if so, then the angels would rejoice to see men do what they need not do!

Suppose I should say to you to day, that, in order to meet God on the Sabbath, and receive God's blessing, you must sleep out on the ground all Saturday night, wet or cold, sick or well. Suppose you do it, and I rejoice to see you do it. Now if this be *not* necessary in order to receive God's blessing, then it would be cruel in me to wish to see you doing it.

You know when you are sick, our parents rejoice to see you swallow, cheerfully, the bitter medicine, because you cannot get well without taking it; but if you could get well just as well without, your parents would never rejoice to see you take it. Now, repentance is disliked as much as medicine is; and if we could go to heaven without it, the holy angels would not rejoice to see us repenting.

Suppose, in going home to day, one of you should break his arm so dreadfully, that it must be cut off, or else you die; and I should call and see you to morrow, and find the doctor there, with his sharp tools all out, ready to cut the arm off, I should rejoice to have it cut off! And why? Not, my dear children, because I should love to see you suffer, or lose your arm; but because your life could not be saved without. And thus you see why the angels rejoice so much over one who repents. It is because none can go to heaven without repentance.

3. My third and last remark is, *that you will all be very wicked if you do not repent immediately.*

And why? Because you are all sinners; and because I have read to you Christ's words, how that the angels would rejoice at it, and have told you *why* they would rejoice. No one is too young to sin, and so it is plain that no one is too young to repent. Because, too, that if you do not repent, you cannot go to heaven. You can play, you may grow up, you may learn your books, you may become rich, if God spares your lives; and may do all this without repentance. But you cannot go to heaven without. You cannot begin to go till you have a new heart.

And now, when you are riding or walking home, not knowing that you will live to see another sabbath; when you see the sun go down to day, not knowing as you will live to see him rise; as you lie down to sleep to night, not knowing that you will ever open your eyes again in this

world,—will you not remember what I have now told you, and go before God and repent! Oh, if you will, there will be joy in heaven over you. Amen.

---

## REVIEW

Of a "Dissertation on the Nature and Administration of Baptism, Part I. By the Rev. WM. SOMMERVILLE, A. M., Horton," Nova Scotia.

(Concluded from page 249.)

To every system of truth or error there is one grand central point. Mr. Sommerville's defence of sprinkling for baptism, although he takes several positions which he attempts to fortify, depends mainly upon one assertion, to which reference is made in the previous number, namely: "Baptism is *not* an ordinance peculiar to New Testament times. It is a *divinely instituted rite of the former dispensation.*" "If this can be proved there appears a most satisfactory reason, why, when baptism is spoken of in the New Testament, there should be no special explanation of its nature or the mode of its administration," &c. Ah! truly uttered, "*if this can be proved*:" if it can be proved that the Mosaic and Christian dispensations are the same—that the conditions of discipleship to Christ are the same as to Moses—or that a member of the congregation in the wilderness, by virtue of that relationship, is entitled to a seat in Christ's house, the church of the living God; yes, if this can be *proved*, then an appearance of plausibility might encircle the above position. We do not, however, admit that even then it would be possible—without a special revelation—to believe that the washing, sprinkling, pouring, &c. of the former dispensation, could all be fused into *one* ordinance, and that invariably expressed by *one* word—baptism!

Indeed this assumption lies at the foundation, not only of sprinkling and pouring for baptism, but also of the church membership of infants. Mr. S. and his numerous brotherhood of Pædobaptists, depend on the establishment of the identity of Old and New Testament covenants for the whole of their theory more than on any other position. It is the central point of the system; the corner stone of the entire superstructure. We will, therefore, give it a passing notice. And is it possible that we must—after all that is said in the christian scriptures in relation to the dispensation from "Mount Sinai which gendereth to bondage," in contrast with "Jerusalem that is above, which is free, which is the mother of us all;" and indeed the grand design of a greater part of Paul's epistles—which is to shew that we are not under Moses but under Christ; we say, must we now attempt to disprove the assumption that the dispensations from Mount Sinai and Mount Zion are identical!!

Yes, lovers of the Law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, must give their attention to this position, for on it the advocates of infant baptism build; if they are right, then have we been greatly mistaken when we have taught that under the new covenant—the christian dispensation—all have God's law engraven on their hearts—"all know the Lord from the least to the greatest." If Mr. S's. assumption can be sustained by the

living oracles, or by the oracles of reason, instead of the covenant given at Sinai becoming old and ready to vanish away near two thousand years ago, it is now in full force, and to it we are to go to learn how to obey Jesus Christ! If the law of Moses and the law of liberty are identical, then have we yet to learn the meaning of that mighty voice that the exiled John heard on Patmos: "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last." We have yet to learn the design of the transfiguration, and especially of that voice which was heard on the holy mount: "This is my beloved Son, hear ye him:" as though he had said, you have heretofore heard Moses and Elijah, you now see them with your master; they have come to lay their honors at his feet; they are your teachers now no longer; this is my Son, *hear him!* These portions and many more must have a different interpretation. The honor of making laws for the congregation must now be divided between Moses and Christ—at least we must first hear him before we can understand Christ—and the apostle James was much mistaken when he said "there is *one* law-giver!!"

But not to deal in exclamations and generalities altogether, we will come to a few facts. Though, who can forbear exclamations when they hear "teachers in Israel" asserting the identity of the Law and the Gospel; that the ordinances of Christ's body (the church) originated, and their meaning, form and design, are to be learned from Moses and not from the ambassadors of Jesus Christ!

1. When Moses was delivering his most interesting valedictory to the congregation of the children of Israel, he said, "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee; of thy brethren like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken." Deut. xviii. 15. Both Peter and Stephen quote this, and apply it to the Messiah. From it we learn that Moses was to remain a lawgiver only until the great Prophet should come. The law was our schoolmaster until Christ came; we are now the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus; for as many as have been baptized into Christ have put him on. If we are Christ's we are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise. And none are Christ's but those who believe and obey him; for "if any man have not the spirit of Christ he is none of his." Rom. viii. 9. These facts ought forever to settle the question of the identity of the two dispensations, were there no other considerations. But the contrasts are so many and so obvious, that it is surprising that teachers of christianity can possibly overlook them; one is called "letter," and the other "spirit;" one the "ministration of death, of condemnation," the other the "ministration of righteousness, of the spirit." Moses was "veiled," but in the Gospel we behold the unveiled glory of Messiah's countenance. The law of Moses was carnal, earthly; its precepts and promises, forms and ceremonies, related to this life, they "sanctified to the purification of the flesh," they "could not take away sin;" but the gospel of Jesus, the blood of the slain Lamb purified the conscience, gave the pledge of a perfect remission, and its blessings extend through the endless succession of eternal ages.

2. No man, however great and good, under Moses, came under Jesus Christ—entered his church—without being created anew. Christ's

body—the church—is a new creation. Simeon and Anna, as well as Nicodemus, “must be born again” to enter his kingdom. Indeed the Saviour himself entered not upon his ministry until he “fulfilled all righteousness” by receiving baptism at the hands of John the Harbinger. Not until then is he publicly acknowledged by a voice from heaven; not until then is he filled with the spirit without measure. And yet according to Mr. S. baptism is a “divinely instituted rite of the former dispensation.” With him the sprinklings, &c. of the law of Moses were the first institutions of baptism! The Saviour was circumcised on the 8th day, and dedicated on the 40th, and had attended to all the “divers baptisms” of the law of Moses—having for thirty years obeyed it in letter and spirit—and yet, he had not received baptism in the New Testament sense of that term. Nicodemus, a teacher in Israel, an honorable councillor, an august member of the great Sanhedrim, and a most acceptable member of the “church” of Moses, is emphatically taught that he must be born again, born of water and spirit, or he cannot enter the kingdom of God: He too had been circumcised, he had received the “divers baptisms” of Moses, what Mr. S. calls the “divinely instituted rite,” and yet according to his own admission, the Saviour commanded him to be baptized, or at least taught its necessity? Most singular, certainly, two institutions identical, and yet the members of one no more part nor lot in the other than the Gentile who knew nothing of any of these meats, drinks, divers washings, &c. ! This is the great radical misconception of Pædobaptists. This identity of the dispensations is the rock on which they lose sight of the spirituality of the christian kingdom. “In Judaism rights to ordinances were *hereditary*; in christianity they are *personal*. It is now, therefore, *faith* and not *flesh*; then it was *flesh* and not *faith*. When will Pædobaptists learn this lesson, that christianity is a *personal affair*! Those called sons of God are all born again. The sons of Abraham were born of the flesh, and therefore, only once born. Christians are born of the spirit after they are born of the flesh. Will Pædobaptists never pay attention to such declarations as these; ‘To as many as (and to no more than) received him he gave the privilege of becoming the sons of God; to them that believe on his name, who were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.’ No one can imagine two societies founded on more opposite principles than faith and flesh, or spirit and flesh. Now when we look on two societies, pure and unmixed, built on the two principles, we shall see a very different result. In one ‘all know the Lord from the least to the greatest;’ all have God’s law written in their hearts; all enjoy his favor and protection; all rejoice in hope of the favor of God. In the other, it is a kingdom like Spain, Portugal, Italy, France—every thing that liveth and moveth upon the face of the earth.” The reader must pardon this digression. We wish, while on what is called the “mode” of baptism, also to show the absurdity of making infants members of the congregation of the Lord.

But it will be natural for the reader to ask, “what proof does Mr. S. bring to show that baptism is ‘a divinely instituted rite of the former dispensation?’” To which we answer: after repeatedly reading and carefully examining his pamphlet we can find but one testimony on

which he confidently relies; but this, he considers, most conclusive. It is true he quotes I Cor. x. 1, 2—"baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea;" and the doctrine of baptism as one "of the principles of the doctrine of Christ;" but in reference to these allusions he thinks it possible that as "the light in men is sometimes darkness, and [that] some are 'ever learning and never able to come to a knowledge of the truth;'" that it is possible that these testimonies may be evaded; "but," he says, "the following passage admits of no evasive explanation. The man who asserts that baptism is exclusively an ordinance of the last days, does so in opposition to a very plain scriptural proposition, and *contradicts the testimony of the Holy Ghost*. 'Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation.' The 'divers washings,' as we read, are divers BAPTISMS."\* This is the record—thus the positive testimony that baptism belonged to a "former dispensation." He who says this is not proof—if he does not commit the unpardonable sin—according to Mr. S. "he *contradicts* the testimony of the Holy Ghost!" Such a sentence having been pronounced, it behoves us to listen and examine with all seriousness. Let us then approach this witness, and ascertain the full amount of his testimony. The reader had better open his Bible at Heb. 9th chapter, and read from the first verse. He will find that the Apostle is on the adumbrative character of the former dispensation. 'The tabernacle, its holy and most holy place, its furniture, its outer-court, and its worship were figurative of something more glorious than was then enjoyed. Of the tabernacle, &c. Paul says, "Which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience" (now comes in the testimony to prove that christian baptism "is a rite of a former dispensation!") "Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings [baptisms], and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation." Heb. ix. 9, 10.

That any man of Mr. S's. talents, education, and keen perception, should quote this passage to prove the perpetuity of the "divers washings" of Moses under the christian dispensation is most surprising. The whole drift of the Apostle's reasoning in this and the following chapter, and indeed in the entire epistle, is to show that the Mosaic dispensation, its lawgiver, priesthood, covenant, sacrifices, rest and promises have passed away, and have given place to a more glorious state of things, called, in the verse under consideration, the "the time of reformation." Whatever then the "divers baptisms of Moses were, the verse expressly states that they were "imposed on them [only] UNTIL THE TIME OF REFORMATION." But Mr. S. says that it is a "passage that admits of no evasive explanation," in proof that baptism is a rite of a former dispensation, and perpetuated during the time of reformation, indeed till Christ shall come again!

Is it possible for us to learn when the "time of reformation" began? If so, we can tell when the "divers baptisms" and "carnal ordinances" ceased. Paul informs us in the very next verse, by placing the gospel dispensation in contrast with the Mosaic—hear him. "But Christ being

come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption." The "time of reformation," then, with Paul was when Jesus entered into the true holy place, heaven itself. Then "divers immersions" and carnal ordinances, *which had existed on the authority of Moses, ceased*; then He sealed the commission of his apostles, and authorized them to command all penitent believers to be baptized in his name for remission of sins. If this verse, on which Mr. S. so confidently relies to establish his main proposition, is not fatal to the identity of the "washings" under the law and the baptism of the gospel, then have we failed entirely in seeking for what he does mean. Had he introduced the various occurrences of the words, in the Old Testament, *wash, pour, and sprinkle*, to prove them identical with similar words in the New, we should not have been so much surprised, though in that we think he would also have failed; but to attempt to prove that christian baptism is an ordinance of the law of Moses by a passage that says the "divers washings" were "imposed until" the great high priest entered upon the duties of his office is most unaccountable; especially when he so "charitably" charges all who might question the correctness of his proposition, with contradicting "*the testimony of the Holy Ghost!*"

Will the reader bear with us while we call his attention to this passage as translated by Mr. S's. good Presbyterian brother, Dr. Macknight, for some time prolocutor of the church of Scotland? His comment and paraphrase are: "*With nothing but meats and drinks, and divers immersions, and ordinances respecting the purifying of the body, imposed only until the time of the reformation of the worship of God by Christ, who was to abolish the Levitical services, and to introduce a worship in spirit and in truth, which may be performed in every place.*" Our "ordinances concerning the flesh" his note is: "*literally righteousness of the flesh; things which make the flesh, not the spirit, righteous.*" Here we see that Macknight not only understands the observances of the law to be merely temporary, but also translates *baptismois*, immersions; thus on two points testifying against Mr. S's. conclusions.\*

\* How is it that Dr. M. and the Rev. Wm. Sommerville both took something like a most solemn oath that they would take the confession of the Westminster Divines as their rule of faith and practice, and yet came to conclusions so different. Mr. S. says in reference to his obligation [page 37], "it ministers no little satisfaction that the examination fully justifies the description of the ordinance furnished by the Westminster Divines, and the propriety of the SOLEMN PROFESSION OF ADHERENCE, made many years since, to this article, in the works compiled by them, as being founded upon and agreeable to the word of God!" And yet, notwithstanding the "satisfaction" that Mr. S. felt that he and the "Divines" came to the same conclusion on the propriety of "sprinkling" or "pouring" of water on the face for baptism; he does not inform the reader how he satisfies his conscience after his "solemn profession of adherence" to their views as being "agreeable to the word of God," when he most pointedly contradicts that declaration in the confession—"Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ," &c. The "Divines" also taught that immersion is a scriptural "mode" of baptism, and yet Mr. S., notwithstanding his "solemn profession of adherence" to what they taught, says on the same page [17] "total immersion, so far from representing the purification and safety of persons, is a symbol of irremediable destruction, and directly opposed to

The baptisms referred to by Paul, were legal purifications—the cleansing the flesh—hence called carnal ordinances. Christian baptism is always in the scripture in the singular, not divers or many. Christian baptism is performed but once, but the washings, ablutions, and immersions under the law were often performed by the same person; when defiled he was sprinkled with the water of purification, and then he washed or bathed himself. The dipping of hyssop, the bird, the finger, the wood, were “divers baptisms,” and these were to “*purify the flesh.*” Paul does not admit that any other benefit was derived from these observances; and what says the Apostle Peter in reference to baptism? “*It is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh*” We are expressly taught that, what Mr. S. calls the primitive institution of baptism, was to cleanse the flesh; it was to remove legal defilement, but Peter says christian baptism was *not* for this purpose, but the “seeking of a good conscience by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.” And that baptism is for the enjoyment of spiritual blessings Mr. S. not only barely admits, but most conclusively proves! If Mr. S. can square his views of baptism as a divinely instituted ordinance of a previous dispensation, when all the ordinances were for the purification of the flesh, while baptism has no such object or design, he can do more than we can now conceive possible. We give him credit for talent and tact, but if he is not in the mists of Judaism, and not under Moses, we know not who is! An old lady once requested a preacher, one that Mr. S. would call an Annabaptist, to baptize her. She said “I once believed that baptism came in the room of circumcision, and I was baptized into Moses. I now wish to be baptized into Jesus Christ!” It is to be feared that there are many like her in the first part of her religious experience; would to heaven there were more like her in a believing submission to the Lord Messiah.

II. *Water sprinkled or poured “expressive of a blessing”—“being immersed in water. is expressive of a ruinous calamity!”* As intimated in a former part of this review, this with Mr. S. is a favorite view. He dwells upon it as though it were a discovery of his own. He holds it up on every suitable occasion as a parent does a darling child, one on which he desires the public should gaze. We will look at this thought in its matured strength. We will see whether sprinkling and pouring for baptism can gain support from the use of water, or the means of using it previous to the christian economy. But we will first hear Mr. S. explain himself, that there may be no mistake. “I submit that the practice of total immersion, in Jew, or christian, is superstitious; that the addition of more water to that which is required and sufficient for sprinkling, that the whole may be covered, is of the same character with the addition of one immersion to another, and another still, or of oil and salt to the baptismal water, and is adapted to pervert the ideas of christians, with reference to an external ordinance, and to leave false and unscriptural impressions, as it proceeds from perverted ideas and false principles. The Greek christian is as fully entitled to three dips, and the Papists to a little salt and oil, as the Annabaptist to more water the spirit of the divine institutions!” Dr. Macknight on the other hand invariably represents baptism as an immersion; but the Dr. is always consistent with himself if not with the “Confession.” and therefore he is with us a favorite.

than is necessary for aspersion, for purification. God discovers a solicitude that nothing, to be purified, be subjected to a process from which it is not naturally fitted to come forth uninjured. Nothing may be exposed to an ordeal which is calculated to destroy it. 'The gold, and the silver, the brass, the iron, the tin, and the lead, every thing that may abide the fire, ye shall make go through the fire, and it shall be clean; and all that abideth not the fire, ye shall make go through the water.' Here is the evidence, and the exemplification of the principle, a principle strictly adhered to in every part of the Mosaic ritual, a principle diametrically opposed to the supposition that washing necessarily implies immersion, and utterly subversive of the practice of immersion for the purification of persons.\* Total immersion at once points to the destruction of persons, and is an apt emblem of destruction, not of safety. \* \* \* The whole tenor of scripture phraseology, respecting the ends fulfilled by coming in contact with water, agrees with the principle stated above, and applied to the solution of the question between immersion in water, and sprinkling and pouring water in legal washings and baptisms of the former or latter dispensations. In every case in which water is described as *coming upon, from above, poured upon, or sprinkled*, it is expressive of a blessing; and, invariably, being immersed in water is expressive of a ruinous calamity to every thing destructible by immersion, and from which, as being destructive to persons, the child of God would humbly pray to be delivered. *Being covered with water, is never represented as a privilege, but a calamity; never a blessing but a curse.*† Mr. S. then goes into an induction of various places in the scripture where sprinkling, pouring, falling of water, &c. are used to denote blessings, and also of the places where immersion or being covered with water are emblematic of judgments, afflictions, &c. And then draws the following "charitable" conclusion: "It would not be an exercise of little ingenuity to furnish even a *plausible argument* against the conclusion, drawn from this principle, that *immersion is alien* from both the *motive* and the *object* of the baptismal ordinance. *Nothing but an impious ingenuity will attempt it*, having the testimony of two inspired writers to the existence of a *contrast* between baptism and immersion." Hear the "testimonies" and the "contrasts" as summed up by our author: "The Israelites were *baptized* but *not immersed*. 2. The Egyptians were *immersed* but *not baptized*. 3. The Israelites were *saved*, and the Egyptians *perished*." Again: "1. The old world was *overflowed* and *perished*. 2. Noah and his family were *saved by water* but not *overflowed*. 3. Salvation by baptism is a *figure*, and the salvation of the eight members of Noah's family is a *figure*. 4. These are *like figures*." He then says "Let it be kept in mind that the preceding quotations from the inspired writers Peter and Paul, have not been introduced for the purpose of ascertaining the propriety of any given form of baptism, but simply to shew that *immersion cannot be the form, in which it is, in any case to be administered to persons.*"

\* It is somewhat surprising that Mr. S. did not explain to the reader how unclean things could pass, or "go through the water," without an immersion, a total immersion of the part defiled! †

† Pages 32 and 33



“ The result of the preceding investigations may habriefly summed up in the following particulars: that the nature or form of any ordinance, and of course of baptism, cannot be learned from the name appropriated to it; that baptism is an ordinance of the Old Testament dispensation, and what is necessary to be known of its nature, intention, and mode of administration, must be learned from that portion of the Living Oracles; that, as to its nature, baptism is an ordinance of purification; that the end of baptism is access to God in union to a Mediator; that the mode of purification or baptism, in all cases agreeing with the case and conditions of New Testament, baptism was by *sprinkling* or *washing*; that there is not *one* case in which, among all the varied and multiplied rites prescribed of old, any man is commanded either to *immerse* himself, or to be immersed; that washing does not imply more than the sprinkling or scattering of water upon the person; that total immersion, so far from representing the purification to safety of persons, is a symbol of irremediable destruction, and directly opposed to the spirit of the divine institutions; and that the allusions to baptism in the New Testament, are, in no instance, at variance with these positions, and in several instances forcibly sustain them.”\*

The reader, now, has before him Mr. S's. arguments and proofs in full for sprinkling &c., and against immersion. He has in our author's own words, his arguments in their entire strength in favor of his darling hypothesis. We will, therefore, proceed to their examination. “ To the law and to the testimony.” Let them be weighed in the balance; and if Tekel does not stand out in legible characters, then have we studied the Scriptures to no purpose. 1. And first the sprinkling and pouring of “ clean water,” in Mr. S's sense of these terms, *was never an ordinance of God under any dispensation*. This may be considered a summary way to dispose of an argument, which is the burthen of a pamphlet so well digested as that before us; but we are confident of its truth. Mr. S. is a plain, nervous writer. He can compel an opponent, not only to *understand* but *feel* his arguments, whether they be true or not. His allusions, then, to the “ salt” and “ oil” of the Papist in connexion with the practice of the “ Annabaptist” immersing in the “ troubled sea,” whose “ waters” already impregnated with salt, “ cast up mire and dirt”—in a pond of standing water, or in a baptistry, whose waters must always be “ polluted to the second person plunged,”† show most conclusively that by “ clean water”—the water that was sprinkled on the unclean, in order to purification, he means pure water in the common acception of the term, that is, water free of mud or other foreign ingredients! But under the law no such water was used for sprinkling or pouring; and Mr. S. ought to have known it. But this he must have lost sight of, or he would not have based his whole system on a fallacy, on the sand! “ Clean water” in the Old Testament sense of the term *was always* impregnated with ashes or blood. It was called clean water, because used to make clean; but those on whom it was sprinkled were not yet clean, they afterwards washed their clothes and bathed their flesh before entering the congregation of the Lord. Advocates of sprinkling for baptism, so often use certain phrases found in the Old Testament without giving them their

\* Page 35, 37.

† Page 24, 25.

proper meaning it may be necessary for us to be a little more particular. "I will sprinkle clean water upon you"—"I will pour water upon the thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground" &c., are expressions of common occurrence in the speeches and books of those who advocate sprinkling and pouring for baptism. Under the law of Moses sprinkling of blood was an every day occurrence: blood was sprinkled whenever a sacrifice was offered; but this could be done only when the blood was warm. The law, hence, needed another type of the Messiah. He was not, as Romanists teach us, to be offered every day, and always to be on the altar: Moses was, therefore, taught to select a "red heifer without spot or blemish, upon which never came a yoke" (Num. xix. 2)—to take her "without the camp," and slay and burn her entire: her ashes were to be preserved, for future use, in a "clean place." The clean water then was to be "running water," mingled with these ashes! All the sprinklings for purification were of this water. Paul refers to this in Heb. ix. 13, 14: "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the [or an] eternal Spirit offered himself to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God." The ashes of the heifer were in such a state that they could be always kept, and had the virtue of the sacrificial blood; and the heifer having been "without spot," they were a fit emblem or shadow of the continual benefit of Christ as the sin offering, always possessing virtue (through the eternal Spirit) to purify our souls. As above noted, the man who became legally unclean must have this "clean water" or the "water of separation" sprinkled upon him the third and then the seventh day; after which he must bathe his flesh—perform a total immersion—before he was clean. *Lavo* is the word invariably used to express the last act. Mr. S. knows the Greeks had a word (*nipto*) for washing hands, face, eyes, feet, or a part of the body; another (*pluno*) for washing clothes and the like; and *lavo* for a total washing. The last is always used when washing is found in the company of baptism. Specifications are not necessary for our readers generally, as they have had every passage in the Old and New Testament where these words occur, in our former volumes.

But to return. "The passage in Ezekiel is always misapplied, except when quoted in the true technical sense of the law, which has given to it its proper signification. The history of the case in Ezekiel is this: the Jews had profaned the name of the Lord, and polluted themselves among the heathen. The Lord said, not for their sake but for his own honor, he would bring them out and restore them to their own land, and as they had, by contact with the heathen, polluted themselves, he, speaking in their own national and appropriate sense of the phrase, said he would cleanse them by sprinkling clean water upon them—a symbol of their sanctification, externally: and also that he would put his Spirit within them: a passage which has no more to do with the sprinkling of common water for baptism, than any other ceremony of the law. Is it possible that any one can suppose that the clean water here spoken of, or in the epistle to the Hebrews, is water free from mud!" Most astonishing that any one, who had even once read the Old and New Testament should

come to such a conclusion! Thus Mr. S.'s fine fabric of sprinkling for christian baptism, passes away like a dream when man awakes. It was conceived amidst the mists and fogs of a dim moonlight dispensation, and before the bright shining of the Sun of Righteousness it passes away like the mists of morning. But let it be admitted that sprinkling and pouring are indicative of blessings. May they not be of the sprinkling of the blood of the slain Lamb and the pouring forth of the Holy Spirit. Much more consistent this conclusion than that the sprinklings &c. of Moses should become a positive institution of the Christian economy, but we dare not draw conclusions in reference to the present and future weal or woe of the human family from types and symbols alone, when we have the "more sure word of prophecy." The condemnation of the Papist comes with a bad grace from one who cannot trace infant sprinkling to a higher source than the darkest hour of Romanism. The primitive Geneva reformers—we presume—as a whole, never had any other baptism than that which they obtained from the Pope's ministers, performed with their salt, oil and spittle! And if to prepare "clean water" for baptism under a dispensation where Mr. S. says the ordinance originated, they mingled ashes or blood—why not allow the Papist to use with his holy water, salt, oil, or what not, without censure?

2. But more surprising it is, that Mr. S. should so fully and emphatically repudiate immersion entirely, because plunging, overwhelming, dipping &c., are indicative or symbolic of judgments. Indeed he has not stopped at the symbolic, but has two grand proofs—the flood, and the destruction of Pharaoh and his army, are literal facts. These certainly were severe, momentous judgments upon the enemies of God, but must we hence conclude that these immersions did not result in great good to God's believing people? What would Mr. S. say to a Socinian who should reason in this manner relative to the great sin offering—the Lord Jesus Christ? and indeed in reference to much of the phraseology of the Christian scriptures. Christ was crucified, died, and was buried, was made a curse for us. Christians, in the Apostles' times, were said to be "fools," "dead," "crucified," "buried," &c. All these designations are expressive of degradation, shame, and suffering; but who enjoys spiritual blessings without knowing their import! Mr. S. would call any one an unbeliever who would object to such terms, because they are not expressive of blessings. Baptism, as admitted by our author, is for remission of sins. the "end" of it, says he, "is access to God in union to a Mediator." Indeed, many of his remarks on the design of the institution are so good that we cannot forbear giving a specimen. Hear him "Ignorance of the nature of baptism, and its place in the economy of divine grace, as an ordinance of divine appointment, produces the hesitancy that too often appears to introduce it to notice, in addressing inquirers after the way to Zion, and in shewing forth to professors the design and application of the work of Christ. Belief, repentance, are often viewed as superseding the necessity of an ordinance to which they are adapted to lead: men are recognized as members of Christ, who are unbaptized—hold it to be superfluous, at most a ceremony of decent respect for its author, or refuse to submit to it, and in Christ, who have never been united to his body, the Church."\*

One grand object of the ordinances of the Gospel is to keep distinctly before saint and sinner the great facts, commands and promises of the Gospel. The great work of the Messiah was not all indicative of promised blessings, why then should his ordinances be symbolic of blessings? Ought we not to be as often reminded of the overwhelming sufferings and afflictions of our Redeemer, as of the blessings that his "passion" and death have procured for us! Indeed the Saviour distinctly alludes to his cup of sorrow, in connexion with his last baptism: he was immersed, overwhelmed with suffering, and he used the same term when speaking of it that he did when commanding his disciples to baptize into the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The act of baptism, then, is present to the eye the facts—the doctrine of the Gospel: Christ *died* for our sins—was *buried*—*arose* again. Those who believed this proclamation, and became members of his body, the church, were subsequently addressed as "having obeyed that form of doctrine" that was delivered them. Neithersprinkling, pouring, washing, nor any application of water to the *person*, can be a fit emblem of this doctrine. But the believer, dead to sin—who gives himself up to God's people, to bury him, to raise him up—obeys the "form" of doctrine; and on the authority of Paul we assert is then "made free from sin."

That immersion is a symbol of suffering, is therefore rather a proof than an objection to it as the meaning of the word *baptizo*, and the only action worthy the name baptism. It is true that Mr. S. (writing against Baptists, who do not believe in baptism for remission), can take quite a formidable stand here; for it is certainly most incongruous to bury God's children—to overwhelm those who have been born into the kingdom of God's dear Son; but to take the sinner with his heart fixed on God, and bury him for a time, to represent the "putting off the old man"—the "body of the sins of the flesh"—by the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, is consonant with our ideas of propriety. In immersion, therefore, we have a full exhibit of the great facts of the gospel, on which we build our hopes of heaven. Mr. S's arguments on this point may perplex the Baptists, for whom his pamphlet was designed; but to those who understand and practise the Apostolic Gospel, it presents no real difficulty. His effort, though ingenious, and as good as could be put forth in defence of a cause so hard to sustain, ought not for a moment to have thrown a doubt upon the mind of a well instructed disciple of Jesus Christ.

3. His allusions to the flood and to the baptism in the Red Sea may require, in the estimation of some readers, a little further notice. The flood was truly an immersion to the sinners that then lived. Mr. S's, good Presbyterian brother, Macknight, admits, nay argues that it was also to Noah and his family an immersion: it could however be only a figurative one. His language, in part, is "As the water of the deluge destroyed the wicked antediluvians, but preserved Noah by bearing up the ark in which he was shut up till the waters were assuaged, and he went out of it to live again on the earth, so baptism may be said to destroy the wicked, and to save the righteous, as it prefigures both these events: the death of the sinner it prefigures by burying of the baptized in the water; and the salvation of the righteous, by raising the baptized person out of the water to live a new life. These things considered,

may not our Lord's words to Nicodemus, 'Except a man be born again of water,' be an allusion to the history of the deluge, and a confirmation of its typical meaning? For Noah's coming forth from the water to live again on the earth, after having been full nine months in the water, might fitly be called his being 'born of water.' consequently as baptism is the antitype, or thing signified by the deluge, a person's coming out of the water of baptism have been called by our Lord his being 'born again of water.' " We have already said that the use of the term baptism in reference to the salvation of Noah, could only be figurative, for he was not literally immersed in the water, neither (while shut up in the ark) was he poured or sprinkled. We therefore coincide with Mac-knight's note on 1 Peter i. 21, as a whole. 'The flood immersed a "sin cursed earth"—it washed away its wicked inhabitants. they had *sprinkling* and *pouring* to perfection, until at last they were overwhelmed. they had *water alone*, and were destroyed. Water without faith will not do. Noah had the ark, faith in God, and the water. The water soon proved a line of demarcation between Noah's family and the corrupt antedeluvians. They at last came out of the ark upon a new earth, and formed a new congregation of the Lord without a single infant; and thus the human family began again, as they did in Eden, without one unbeliever or unconscious babe!

In reference to the baptism of the Israelites "into Moses in the cloud and in the sea," we need take but a passing notice. Our previous remarks in relation to Noah's family, and indeed on the whole premises, have already suggested to the reader the proper view of this subject. The word baptism in 1 Cor. x. 2, cannot have a literal meaning, whatever definition may be attached to the word; for the Israelites had neither the water poured or sprinkled on them. The word of the Lord expressly says, they "went on dry land in the midst of the sea." Ex. xv. 19; Heb. xi. 29; Ex. xiv. 22. 29. this they could not have done if the clouds were dropping rain, or if the wind was blowing the spray upon them from the sea. But the apostle says they were all baptized in the cloud and in the sea. Neither the cloud nor the sea alone, but in the cloud and in the sea. The cloud first before them, then over their heads, and behind them, and the sea on either hand—for a time completely buried them. Their immersion was complete, not in water, but in the cloud and sea. Their temporary immersion was to them a great blessing; for they were hid from their enemies, and finally emerging from the sea, they left their enemies where every obedient believer leaves his—in the water that forms the boundary between the land of bondage and the high road that leads to the Canaan of God. The children of Israel had God and their mediator Moses, and faith and immersion, and they experienced a great salvation. All their enemies that opposed them sank like lead beneath the mighty waters; and like the believing obedient Ethiopian officer, in Gospel story, they "went on their way rejoicing." But the Egyptians had water alone, without God and without faith, and immersion was to them a curse—it proved their ruin. Let those who have nothing but water take warning.

To conclude. We did intend noticing a few other points, but they do not affect the main questions which we have considered, namely—

1. Mr. S has asserted that none of the attendant circumstances of baptism in the New Testament, give any explanation of the mode. We have shewn that the *prepositions* used in construction compel a translator to render baptize by immersion or an equivalent term, and forbid in any instance the use of pour or sprinkle; that the use of the terms "buried," "planted," "raised up," &c.; the places where baptism was performed—"in Jordan," where there was "much water;" their going "down into the water," and "coming up from it," &c., are expressions too obviously in favor of immersion to be misunderstood by those who confine their investigations to the Word of God; and that the expression "born of water" can never be understood on the hypothesis, that baptize means to sprinkle or to pour water on the subject.

2. Mr. S. has asserted that baptism is an ordinance of the previous economy. Our arguments on this and the following heads need not be repeated, as they are before the reader in the present number.

3 That the "divers baptisms" of Moses could not be identical with christian baptism, inasmuch as they were to continue only till the "time of reformation"—that is, the establishment of the christian dispensation.

4. We have proved that sprinkling and pouring common water was not an ordinance of God under the previous dispensation, and therefore could not possibly be the origin of a christian ordinance.

5. That Mr. S's objections to immersion on the ground that it was symbolic of judgments from God, were of no avail, since immersion was for remission of sin; and we should have in the ordinance an expression of God's displeasure to sin, as well as the justification of a sinner by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.

6. And we have in our many digressions alluded to various other points in his pamphlet. We have endeavored to treat Mr. S. respectfully. We have opposed his principles only. We respect his talents, and admire his boldness in asserting his views openly and fully, and opposing what he believes to be no baptism at all. If we have passed over or misstated any principal argument, we shall be most happy to insert a correction. And finally, we have reviewed his pamphlet, not so much because in our judgment the cause of truth demanded it, but because others expected us to say something on the subject, and we were willing to gratify them. The task was one that ought to have been performed by the *literati* of Acadia College, Horton, N. S., the "Anabaptists" as Mr. S. contemptuously calls them. We have waited two years since we first saw it, and have at last written a review in great haste. All which we submit to our readers, with more confidence in the truth we advocate than in our ability to sustain it. May the Lord bless all who love and fear and obey him.

W. W. E.

---

### CULTIVATION OF THE MIND.

CULTIVATE the power to fix the mind on any subject you please.

Fix in the mind the elementary principles of all that pertains to life, such as the principles of science, of business, of politics, of government, laws, and religion.

Obtain the power of using language, and defining what you mean by such terms as are in common use when we speak or think.

Fill the mind with the materials of thought ; such as the facts which we read, observe, and hear.

Teach the mind where to go for information ; that is, from what source to draw.

Teach the mind how to take up a subject, investigate it, and draw conclusions on which you may rely.

Cultivate the judgment as to what facts are worth preserving, and what are applicable in proving or illustrating a particular subject.

Cultivate the memory, so that the materials which you gather may not be disseminated and lost as fast as gathered,

You will think, perhaps, that I have laid out the work of a life here, and so I have intended to do ; but if you will read these objects over again, I believe you will say that no one of these can be omitted in cultivating the mind in a proper manner. You will not, of course, have all these objects specially before the mind whenever you exercise it ; but they are to be the points to which you are to bring the mind in all its wanderings, and in a cultivated mind these several points will unconsciously receive attention.

Perhaps this is not the place, but it cannot be greatly out of place, to say that, in my estimation, all this only looks to a far higher and nobler object—which is to prepare that mind to be the receptacle of light and knowledge, the image of God, and the unseen glories of an eternal state. In all contemplations of the mind, I look upon it as an immortal existence, and that it is for that state of immortality, it is now to be disciplined and prepared.

Education does not mean going to school in your boyhood, or going to college in your youth ; but it means the power to take your mind and make it an instrument of conveying knowledge and good impressions upon other minds, as well as being itself made happy. To cultivate the mind, then, does not mean to read much or little, to converse and to observe ; but to discipline it in all ways in your power.

You must not have narrow views on this subject, or else I lose my labor. I do not expect that every one will discipline his mind so that he can observe and think as well as Franklin ; but what then ? Is this a reason why you should not do what you can ? Neither could Franklin reason like Sir Isaac Newton, and bring the universe at his feet. What then ? Was this a reason why he should not do all that he could ?—*Todd's Hints.*

---

NOT A COPY OF THE SCRIPTURES TO BE PROCURED IN ROME.—I soon ascertained the address of every bookselling establishment in Rome, and commenced my tour of search. I visited in person every shop, and in every shop was informed that they had not a copy of the Holy Scriptures in the language of the people. I asked on every occasion why they did not possess so important a book, and on every occasion they replied, “*Non e permesso*” (it is not permitted), or “*E proibito*” (it is prohibited.) The result was the fullest confirmation of the statement which was made to me ; for I could not obtain a portable copy in the establishment of any bookseller in Rome.—*H. Seymour's Pilgrimage to Rome.*

## SUNRISE AT SEA.

A BEAUTIFUL DESCRIPTION—BY ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

I do not recollect that I ever before so much admired the rising of the sun as on the morning of the 16th of August. We had a very agreeable and delightful night down the Sound, but were rather crowded in our sleeping apartments. I awoke with the morning Star, and going up on deck, from the brilliant and mild appearance of the heavens I anticipated the glories of the sun rising at sea; and accordingly hastened to awake my companions to enjoy with me the richest of nature's feasts.

Soon as we were all seated on the upper deck at the stern, with our faces to the East, while yet the Morning Star beamed in a cloudless sky, we began each to designate the spot from which we expected the sun to lift upon us his effulgent countenance. As we gazed upon the pacific and silvery bosom of the tranquil sea, which, as a splendid mirror, seemed to reflect the glories of the heavens afresh upon us with every tremulous swell which urged us to the desired haven, we saw a brightness in the Orient which indicated to us the near approach of the joyful monarch of the day. The crepuscular glimmerings gradually spread over all the East, and as they swept a loftier arch towards the Empyrean they assumed the brightness of liquid brass; while deeply bedded in the far distant horizon, two pyramidal columns began to rise as if the clouds from the Atlantic had suddenly formed themselves into pillars for the gates of the morning, erecting a sublime porte for the entrance of Nature's luminary. Instantly the sovereign streaked with gold the inner side of those two colossal pillars, from between which he seemed resolved to enter upon the race of a summer day. Deeper and broader he laid on the molten gold till these two columns capped with rubies stood gilded from top to bottom. The curtains of night, which seemed to encircle this glorious arch, culminated over the spot where the eyelids of the morning began to open; but before we could take the dimensions of this new portico of day, the sun himself in all the gorgeousness of his own peerless glory, gently raised himself as if to peep over the silvery deep from which he was about to emerge. After a single glance, which dazzled on the back of every gentle curl on the surface around him, he suddenly, at a single bound, stood upon the sea, and by another effort drew after him from the briny deep a golden pedestal as if from a furnace of liquid fire, on which he seemed for a moment to sit, while from his dazzling locks, floods of light and splendor began to flow. His yellow hairs, as if baptized in a sea of glory, dropped light and joy upon a world starting into life, while the gradual expanding of his wings proclaimed him about to fly the circuit of the universe. Bidding farewell to sea and land, he began his flight in heaven; and as he onward and upward bent his way, I was reminded of Jesse's son, who, while a shepherd boy, used to sing—"The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handy work. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. No speech nor language is there where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. In them he has set a tabernacle for the sun, who as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, rejoiceth as a strong



man to run a race. His going forth is from the end of heaven and his circuit to the end of it, and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof."

TO THE BAPTIST MINISTERS OF NEW BRUNSWICK AND  
NOVA SCOTIA—No. 7.

GENTLEMEN—From some of your number, I have heard that incidental remarks in my letters are questioned. I therefore conclude that if the main features could be successfully assailed by you, before the public, there are, at least, some among you who would attempt a defence of your distinguishing peculiarities.

Were it not for the influence on some minds, of a single doubt expressed, in reference to the least branch of an argument on the whole question, I should pursue the even tenor of my way without pausing to answer any objections until I had filled up the outline proposed by myself. Minds there are that will contemplate a score of arguments against a loved theory, and in favor of another entirely subversive of it, without the ability to utter a rational thought for or against; but if a single defect in the *least* of these arguments can be made apparent by another, the entire series are thrown to the winds! All of you, conversant with human nature and the cavils of those who are more attached to a party than to the truth, have doubtless often noticed this fact. Objection 1st. Several have intimated that my statements, in reference to communications prepared for the Baptist Magazine by the late Elder Crawford, of Prince Edward Island, are not true. Now, admitting for a moment that I have made incorrect statements in relation to these manuscripts, does that fact invalidate a single argument in favor of the positions advanced by me? For what purpose were these documents named in connexion with these letters? Why was Elder Crawford's name associated with this discussion? For a single purpose which ought to have been apparent to all: namely, To prove that you, or at least your Editors were *not impartial*, that you were *not willing* that your people should read and hear *both* sides of a question involving your peculiarities: nay more; that in various ways you have endeavored to prevent the people giving, what we call the apostolic gospel, a hearing! Is this so, or not? So far from denying it, I know the greater part of you justify the course that has been pursued by your Editors in closing your columns and pages to communications questioning the "doctrines" of the denomination. And I have yet to learn where the Baptist ministers have not used their influence to prevent the community in every city, town, village and hamlet in the country, hearing the ancient gospel when it has been first announced! To make this apparent, I simply alluded to the manner in which Elder Crawford's communications had been disposed of. And this is the point which is disputed; not that I was wrong in the position that you were not impartial inquirers after the truth; not that I was mistaken in saying that you wished to prevent your people hearing both sides of questions which you were bringing before them. No, no, but that the Editors of the Magazine did not *absolutely*, only *conditionally*, reject Elder Crawford's communication! The facts, so far as I am concerned, are these: unsolicited and unsought for by me, the documents published on pages

93 and 212 of this volume, were placed in my hands for examination. In the presence, and in the hearing of a number of brethren, I then read those documents. By some of them I was informed that they were written, as the heading shows, for the Baptist Magazine; that in the remainder of the article Elder C. had shewed the place that baptism and the Lord's supper held in the christian economy; that on my return to Saint John I would probably get the rest of it; that it was the actual manuscript that had been refused a place in the Magazine; and had been, therefore, sent back to him. As intimated in a former paper, these are the statements made to me in the presence of a goodly number of witnesses. I believed them, and therefore wrote and acted accordingly! The documents speak for themselves. If they were never sent to the Editors of the Magazine then my informant was mistaken, and I have given publicity to the mistake; but if they were, then are some of your memories at fault. Thus stands the *first* objection. Objection 2d. It is assumed that I have in my *fifth* letter made a false issue, inasmuch as I have said that the Baptists have given a public adhesion to that article in the new creed of the "Evangelical Alliance," which asserts the "*justification of a sinner by FAITH ALONE.*" It is said that but a few of your number favored the Alliance; that when the question was brought before your Association, you refused to become identified with that illustrious body; and that in fact you do not, without special qualification, subscribe to the doctrine of justification by faith alone. From all that I can learn, the point in my letter, No. 5, which is questioned, is in the words following: "The Baptists of Britain, the United States, and these Provinces, have given in their unqualified adhesion to the Alliance." It is not questioned that this is the truth in reference to the baptists of Britain and the United States, but it is said that so far from the New Brunswick and Nova Scotia baptists countenancing the Alliance, they refused to become parties in that "Evangelical Union!" Well, I have this to say for myself, if I have been led into a mistake, it has been by the active, influential members of your body whom I found in Saint John, on my arrival in the spring of 1846. Then no meetings among dissenters were more popular than those of the Evangelical Union, that had previously been formed. The object of the Union was advertized in the city papers. Some accused its promoters with having a political object in view, but its friends represented it as an auxiliary, or a branch, of the great European Protestant Alliance. In that light I viewed it. When asked why I did not become a member of it, I gave many reasons; some of them formed the substance of an article in the 3d volume of *The Christian* [page 139]. In its meetings none stood out more prominently than the Baptist Ministers; none appeared to take a more lively interest in promoting the objects of the Union. It was from a most active and influential member of your body I heard an exposition of the fraternal articles of the Alliance, the one on "faith alone" not excepted. To what conclusion then could I come; to what would you, gentlemen, have come under these circumstances, and with these data before you? Would it not be that the baptist ministers generally were in favor of the Alliance? Would you think it possible that *three* or *four* ministers of a denomination, having the pastoral charge of more than one sixth of

the members of an entire provincial association would join an alliance not approved by the rest; that they would publicly advocate justification by faith alone unless it received the general sanction of the body? I ask again, was it not perfectly natural for me to draw the conclusion that I did, viz. : that the Baptist ministers of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were favorable to the Alliance, and (what was my alone purpose in referring to your position to that association) that you heartily responded to the doctrine of justification by faith alone.

Now, although I have called your attention to my reasons for the conclusions to which I came, yet I fear that this objection to my letters is all for effect! A conscious want of scriptural proof to sustain the doctrine of justification by faith alone, may tempt you to repudiate any affection for the Alliance; but will it change your position to that doctrine, or will a charge of a want of truth in any statement of your membership in the Evangelical Union—in the most remote degree—invalidate the truth of my arguments against this radical point in your system?

I have said that your teachings were contrary to the word of God. I uttered my sincere convictions. I was not willing to fix on a point that might be enveloped in the clouds and mists of metaphysics; neither was I willing to introduce a subject that might involve the discussion of great mysterious doctrines; much less mere opinions and speculations. I wished to introduce an important point; one that would be encircled by the grand prominent facts in the full range of Apostolic teaching. In a word, I wished to reduce the controversy to its narrowest limits. I am often asked in what we differ from you. I wished to answer the inquiry. From all that I had heard and read of Baptists, whether of the school of Gill or Fuller, I supposed that they all agreed in one point, and that was justification by faith alone. This is *not* clearly expressed in your creed, and it *is* in the creed of the Alliance. Believing on the testimony above given, that these views met your hearty approbation, I fixed upon them unhesitatingly as the exponent of your faith! And now what do you say? "We did not give our unqualified adhesion to the Alliance!" Though you may *not* have done so in form, yet the Baptists of Britain and America have done so in *form* and in *fact*, as much as any other denomination on the two continents. So far from discountenancing it, *some* of the most prominent members of your body have given to it their most unqualified support. But even admit that my statement is entirely destitute of the truth, in reference to your connexion with that body—does not the main position examined in my letter meet your approbation: have you not—*ALL OF YOU*—*taught that so soon as an individual believes with all his heart, that he is JUSTIFIED before God?* If you have any thing to say for your cause, all your arguments should have this point in view; and not whether I was right or wrong relative to your formal union with the Alliance. If you say you are not members of that body, and prove that you do not believe that article of their faith, I stand publicly corrected!

But is it a fact that any of you have ever announced any other act of the mind or the body, ordained by heaven as the consummating act, in order to justification? Do you add to this, prayer, praise, penitence, almsgiving, baptism, confession? No, not one or any of these. What

do you say to one "under concern of mind," to an "awakened sinner," to one who is "anxious." You believe they are penitent; they fast, they pray; they go from week to week, from month to month, and sometimes for years, mourning; seeking, praying for pardon—for an assurance of acceptance with the Lord. I know, by a painful experience of seven years, that this is true! The greater part of you, either by personal experience or by observation, know that this is the history of a large proportion of your churches—until, perhaps, the last half score of years. What then did you teach was the reason that these persons did not pass from a state of condemnation to a state of justification? Did you not teach them that it was a want of faith? In vain did we, who were in this state of anxiety, say I believe with all my heart; and this was not a vain pretence, or an ignorant assent, for we *did* believe all the great facts concerning the fall of man, his sinfulness, and the sacrificial death of the Lord Messiah for the sins of men, as unhesitatingly as we now do: but we were without peace or the evidence of pardon—and why? for this good reason: *God's word furnished us not one promise of PARDON.* Had we imagined ourselves pardoned, our confidence would have been based upon the wisdom of man and not on the word of God. Our confidence then of acceptance with God would have been as weak and as fluctuating as changing man. There is a step, an act, a something between unfeigned faith, and the enjoyment of pardon. Preach, practice as we may, every one sees, feels, or realizes it. Men may theorise on faith alone, or of ten thousand acts of the mind or affections: an open, overt act, dependent on one's will, is felt by all to be necessary in order to the enjoyment of God's favor proffered in the Gospel. You all see this; you all act on this principle, though you do make faith the last act; and so do all other "Evangelical" parties. You have your anxious seats, your inquiring or class meetings; you call on the anxious to rise for prayers; you tell them to add to their faith and their penitence, prayer; and thus while you in theory say faith alone, in the development of it, you teach every thing else but just what God has commanded. This is the view I am compelled to take of all your communities. I ask you in all sincerity if it is not so? Is not the theory of Evangelical protestantism, faith alone for justification, and the practice for the last twenty years every thing else besides faith, except teaching the sinner to trust in that promise of the Lord Jesus Christ, "He that believeth, and is baptised, shall be saved?"

I am aware, gentlemen, that when you use the word faith, that you often attach a different meaning to it from what I do. I shall not now pause to investigate the difference. In passing, I would simply remark that I receive the Apostles' definitions in their most obvious acceptation. "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." "I pray not for these [Apostles] only, but for all them also who shall believe on me through their word." "These things are written that you might believe." Faith is the confidence of things hoped for, and the conviction of things not seen. Though we may differ in our interpretation of these and parallel passages of the divine record, yet on one point we shall fully agree; and that is, *the faith of the Gospel must be possessed by every sinner before he is a fit subject for immersion*—Immersion into the name

of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, *without* true "saving" faith is of no avail—is a mockery of the ordinance—is profane. Here we can meet. Now for the point from which we diverge. You say that those who possess this faith, this true unfeigned faith, are justified, regenerated, pardoned, born again. Do you not? We teach that this faith must be confessed by an humble, penitent immersion into the name of the Divinity, before the sinner comes within the promise of pardon—before any one has the assurance of God's word that they are one of the regenerated sons or daughters of the Lord Almighty. Now whether right or wrong, no one who can put two ideas together can misunderstand our position! Its correctness must be determined by the testimony of God's word.

Again: you will agree with me in the conclusion that next to faith in the Supreme Being, and in that glorious fact of the new covenant that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of the Living God—I say *next* to this knowledge, Heaven's plan of dispensing pardon to his sinful creatures is most important. To this subject then, gentlemen, I invite special attention. Aside from all personalities and every other denominational consideration, I invite you to a friendly discussion. I will not ask for a hearing in your paper or in your meeting houses, but will give page for page in *The Christian*; or if any prefer it, discuss the question *vis a voce* before those who may choose to listen. Do not call this a challenge: the proposition is not made with that intention; but sincerely, for the purpose of inducing a re-examination of all your premises and conclusions in reference to this most important point in the Christian system—the *conditions of salvation*, through the mediation of the Lord Messiah. You say the condition is Faith. We say—ever since man became a transgressor, to *faith* and every *other* mental act a positive institution has ever been added, in order to *test* the worshipper's sincerity, and to put him into the possession of the enjoyment of God's favor. By *unbelief*, which issued in an overt act of disobedience to a positive institution of Heaven, our first parents lost the favor of God, and "brought death into our world, and all our woe." It was not by unbelief alone, but unbelief made manifest by disobedience. The tempter said "You shall *not* surely die." It was the act that this *lie* called forth that plunged them into ruin and death: they trampled on God's authority in disobeying an act as simple as that of partaking of the fruit of a certain tree! Why then should it be thought a thing incredible, especially by you who profess to take the Word of God as the alone rule of faith and practice—that God should place a positive ordinance between the sinner's faith and the tree of life. By *unbelief* and *disobedience* man first lost the favor of God—why then think it unreasonable that Heaven should ordain faith and obedience to bring him again into his favor. Pardon me, if I exclaim O how weak your faith! You can believe and teach that the sinner may experience pardon, engaged in prayer or in meditation, as he walks by the way, in his house, in a grove, or in a place of worship—in your opinion he may be regenerated while searching the Word of God, reading the "christian experience" of some pious saint—hearing the gospel, or even in a dream or vision of the night. Yes, you can believe all this without the record of *one* such instance—*one* such conversion, since Jesus rose from the dead; but on the plainest, the most express

Declarations of the New Testament, you cannot believe that a sincere penitent can obtain pardon, and the benefits of the blood of the New Covenant in the waters of baptism, in obedience to the express command of the Holy Spirit, for this very purpose! Is it possible that there can be such credulity on the one hand, and such a want of faith on the other! Now, gentlemen, I appeal to your own consciences for the truth of these allegations. With how much confidence have you, presiding over "Conference" and "Church" meetings, listened to the relation of the dreams, impulses, feelings, griefs, sorrows and joys of young converts: whereas if one should have arisen, and most solemnly have stated that they found peace and pardon so soon as they were, on a profession of their faith and repentance, immersed into the name of the Lord—your countenance would have fallen, and your confidence in his conversion would have been greatly weakened, and very probably you would have charged him to be careful that he did not trust in his own performances for salvation! In the estimation of many there is much more danger of trusting to one's own performances when they say they expect a fulfilment of God's promises in obedience to his expressly revealed will, than when they dwell almost exclusively on what they have felt and experienced, although nothing of the kind was ever recorded of any saint in the Christian Scriptures! If sinners are not properly instructed there is just as much danger of trusting to faith, to one's own prayers or those of others, as there is of trusting to baptism. Believing however as we do, that the Gospel finds its way to the affections through the understanding, we always warn our hearers not to trust for salvation to any thing's out of the great sin offering. We always teach that faith, repentance, baptism, prayer, praise, and all the ordinances of the Gospel, are so many means through which the virtue of Jesus' blood flows into the soul, to give it in the first place spiritual life, and then to keep open the intercourse between God and the soul. We have adopted the Apostle's motto, "All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ." And we are content to trust to his wisdom as to the best way of receiving the "word of reconciliation." We remind our hearers that there was no virtue in the waters of Jordan to cleanse Naaman the Syrian of his leprosy, more than Abana and Pharpar, those beautiful streams which incander through the plains of Damascus. But God's presence and power presided over the former and not over the latter, simply because he had not so ordained. Naaman obeyed, and he washed. He had lived and died a leper, notwithstanding the provisions made for his recovery, had he persisted in his refusal to obey the prophet Elisha.

We invite frequent attention to the Israelites in the wilderness, who were bitten by the serpent. The brazen serpent possessed no virtues to check the influence of the poison that was coursing through their veins, and, doubtless for this reason God ordained it. Had it possessed any medical virtues, the people would have attributed their cure to these rather than to God. He has always ordained the most *unlikely* means, according to the wisdom of man, of accomplishing his purposes. Their faith did not save them, nor their looking, any more than the serpent of brass, but these were all necessary to bring the bitten, dying Israelite into a position in which God had purposed to be present by his power to

heal. They were thus led to trust in God, and not in the serpent or in their own works.

We also teach our hearers, that although the Saviour told the woman who had been so long diseased that her faith saved her, he did not say "faith alone." Her faith brought her to the Saviour: under its influence she pressed through the crowd and touched the hem of his garment; but neither her faith, her pressing through the crowd, nor the hem of the garment, healed her; for Jesus said, "some one hath touched me, for I perceive that virtue hath gone out of me." It was the "virtue" that flowed from the Lord that saved her; and although the previous steps did not heal her, yet they were all "essentially" necessary in order to open up a communication between the great physician and her diseased body. She was healed by the Lord, and not by her own works.

By these, and other scriptural illustrations, we show that "we are saved not by works of righteousness which we have done, but by the mercy of God, in the laver of regeneration, by the renewing of the Holy Spirit."

As baptism is plainly and obviously commanded in the New Testament "for remission of sins," and *for no other purpose*; on this authority we teach that it is necessary for every believer to "obey this form of the doctrine" of the Lord, in order to come into the full enjoyment of the redemption which is in Christ Jesus. In the Lord's Supper we receive the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ symbolically; so in immersion, the believer has a symbolic application of the shed blood of the Lamb, who was offered to bear away the sins of men. On no other hypothesis can many portions of the divine record be explained. Take one for example: Ananias says to Saul, "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Now, one of two conclusions must be drawn; either the blood of Jesus Christ was present, symbolically, to wash away Saul's sins, or he was cleansed by the baptismal waters. The latter neither of us believes. How can you escape the former conclusion?

The devout Israelite found the sacrificial blood at the altar, and was there virtually sprinkled from an evil conscience; he there, although his conscience condemned him for his impurity, saw the way by which he might be cleansed, but not until he came to the laver was he made clean: to the laver, which stood between God's altar and the holy place, he must come to get the answer, or rather to seek a good conscience. Coming to the conclusion that baptism is the consummating act in Heaven's plan of bestowing pardon, every thing in the Patriarchial, the Mosaic, and the Christian dispensations harmonize; but on any and every other hypothesis, every thing is dark and unintelligible. To make faith, feeling, action, all necessary to a change of state, fully harmonizes with all our ideas of various relations in which we stand to our fellow men. In other words, this view of the subject of regeneration shows the propriety of the various designations which individual disciples and congregations have obtained. Christians are reconciled to God. When parties are enemies, to effect a reconciliation there must be a *confidence* created; good will towards each other; the *yielding* of the offender, and the *overt* act by which this state of mind is made manifest and confirmed. So the term

*adoption* implies the three acts; and the same may be said of every title given to the saint in the New Testament. Are they called citizens? For an individual of one nation to become one of another, he must receive the constitution of the country of which he would become the adopted son; he must make application for citizenship, and in a formal manner renounce the former government, and take the oath of allegiance. Is the church called the bride, the Lamb's wife? Then to become a member, we must confide in him, place our affections on him, and then give the public a solemn pledge. Even under the former dispensation the three steps were necessary in order to forgiveness. The sinner must take his sacrifice to the altar, kill it, and confess his sins before that altar on which the awful name JEHOVAH was inscribed. Indeed, a system of faith alone, of works alone, of circumcision alone, or any abstract principle, never could have come from a being who has only fully revealed himself to the world as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Modern systems are not philosophical, neither are they adapted to the nature and conditions of men. Man has a body, a soul, and a spirit. A system adapted to him must have something for the whole man. The apostolic gospel has: human systems have not. The apostles proclaimed the gospel that men might believe; here was a system of facts for the spirit, the mind of man: they commanded them to repent, to reform; here was the dedication of the affections to the Lord, action for the soul: and then there was baptism, that has particular reference to the body, but is designed for the consecration of the whole man to the Lord. How perfect the system.

But my time would fail, if your patience would not become exhausted, were I to attempt but a synopsis of the ten thousand proofs and illustrations that present themselves of this delightful view of God's plan of bringing man back to his home, in preparation for a return to the immortal Eden. The *three great facts* proclaimed to sinners—the death, burial, and resurrection; the *three commands*—believe, repent, be baptized; and the *three promises*—remission of sins, the Holy Spirit, and eternal life: these are sufficient to bring the subjects clearly before the careful bible reader, and fully to confirm the wavering that no one proclaims the commands of the apostolic gospel who withholds baptism for the remission of sins.

So certain as he who teaches theology without making prominent the revealed relations of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, gives but a partial view of the Divinity; and he who theorizes on the nature of man as a mortal or an immortal being, as being all body, or all soul, or all spirit, loses sight of the man whom the word of God reveals; just so he who preaches faith alone, spirit alone, or doctrine alone, and loses sight of faith, and repentance, and baptism, or gives them a wrong place in the christian economy, preaches another gospel, which the apostles proclaimed not! May Heaven save us from the Apostolic anathema!

Your's faithfully.

W. W. EATON.

WE are about to preach a sermon, albeit not given to such matters. It shall not be long, and if it reach a few hearts, we shall be content. Is it not astonishing that the thought of "the end of all things" so seldom



enters the minds of men busy with the world's cares? What merchant handling his ledger, what mechanic using his tools, what sailor looking on the passing wave, pauses to think that the book and steel and wave will outlast the feeble arm that now converts them to its uses; and when the brain that directs them is dust, the book will lie unopened, the steel will be in other hands, the wave will roll steadily from shore to shore.

It is conceded that no mechanism of art or of nature equals the structure of our bodies. It is granted that no skill of man has approached it in the remotest degree; and that it is as far above the finest devices of genius as those delicate constructions are above the worthless stones in the street. Yet the work of man's hands will last a thousand years, and man will not outlast the first century. It would appear that no man, looking on the strength of ordinary brute matter, or on the imperishability of man's thoughts, could fail to ask himself if death is the end of all.—*N. Y. J. C.*

**AN INVALUABLE LESSON TO STUDENTS.**—What you do know, know thoroughly. There are few instances in modern times, of a rise equal to that of Sir Edward Sugden. After one of the Weymouth elections, I was shut up with him in a carriage for twenty-four hours. I ventured to ask him what was the secret of his success. His answer was, "I resolved, when beginning to read law, to make every thing I acquired perfectly my own, and never to go to a second thing till I had entirely accomplished the first. Many of my competitors read as much in a day as I read in a week, but at the end of twelve months, my knowledge was as fresh as on the day it was acquired, while theirs had glided away from their recollection."—*Memoirs of Sir T. F. Buxton.*

**ON LISTENING TO EVIL REPORTS.**—The longer I live, the more I feel the importance of adhering to the rule which I had laid down for myself in relation to such matters:—1. To hear as little as possible, whatever is to the prejudice of others. 2. To believe nothing of the kind till I am absolutely forced to it. 3. Never to drink into the spirit of one who circulates an evil report. 4. Always to moderate as far as I can, the unkindness which is expressed towards others. 5. Always to believe that if the other side was heard, a very different account would be given of the matter.—*Life of Simon.*

### THE FIELD OF THE WORLD.—BY MONTGOMERY.

Sow in the morn thy seed,  
At eve hold not thine hand;  
To doubt and fear give thou no heed,  
Broad cast it o'er the land.  
Beside all waters sow,  
The highway furrows stock,  
Drop it where thorns and thistles grow  
Scatter it on the rock.  
The good, the fruitful ground,  
Expect not here nor there;  
O'er hill and dale, by plats, 'tis found;  
Go forth, then, everywhere.  
Thou know'st not which may thrive;  
The late or early sown:

Grace keeps the precious germs alive;  
When and wherever strown,  
And duly shall appear,  
In verdure, beauty, strength,  
The tender blade, the stock, the ear,  
And the full corn at length.  
Thou canst not toil in vain;  
Cold, heat, and moist and dry  
Shall foster and mature the grain,  
For garner in the sky.  
Thence when the glorious end,  
The day of God is come,  
The angel reapers shall descend,  
And Heaven cry—"Harvest home!"