

The "One Baptism;"

ITS MODE, SUBJECTS, PRE-REQUISITES, AND DESIGN.

Who Shall Administer?

BY ELDER T. W. SMITH.

Published by the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, Palos, Kendall Co., Ill.

I. THE MODE OF BAPTISM.

Paul, in his letter to the Ephesians, mentions, among other principles of the doctrine of Christ, that of "one baptism." The religionists of the present day, though they differ widely as to what constitutes this one baptism, and its mode of administration, yet professedly accept Paul's testimony.

One class affirms that *sprinkling*, another, that *pouring*, another, that *immersion*,—or submerging of the whole body in water, is the scriptural mode, while a fourth party, with better show of pleasing the largest number, graciously admit that all or either are right, but assert that none are essential to salvation. And, indeed, upon this point many agree, who hold most strenuously to their respective theories as to the mode.

Can each of these various forms of administering this ordinance be correct? Does not the term itself imply or express the manner of administration?

These are legitimate queries. And it becomes us to candidly and critically consider them.

The main point at issue is, what does the term itself mean? If that can be determined the case is settled so far as the mode is concerned.

Is the term *baptism*, an English ex-

pression or not? The propriety of this question is evident from the fact that, if it is a common English word, common custom and usage will determine its meaning, and that meaning will be generally admitted. Sprinkling, pouring and immersion, in the English language, have each their own signification, and their distinctiveness is recognized wherever that language is spoken.

Is it a word from another language? If so, we must learn from the custom of the language it belongs to the application of it, to determine its signification.

The word is not primarily an English one, but a Greek term anglicized—a *transfer* and not a *translation*. The New Testament was originally written in the Greek language, and our common English Testament is a translation of the text of Erasmus, which is a version of the Latin Vulgate compared with Greek text. However, as it is a translation, indirectly of the Greek, we turn to that language for an explanation of the term "Baptizo."

Elder D. Millard, who, traveled extensively in Greece some years ago, stated that there, the uniform practice in baptizing was by *immersion*, and that, without exception. The Greeks defined *Baptizo*, to immerse, and *Bap-*

tism—immersion. Prof. Stewart, of Andover College, Drs. Campbell, Doddridge, and McKnight,—Mr. R. Barclay, a learned Quaker, and others of Pedo-Baptist views translate the original, and its derivatives, immerse, immersion, immersed. Various versions of the New Testament, among others, "McKnight's," "The Emphatic Diaglott," and the "American Bible Union," a late work brought forth by various learned men of different persuasions, render "Baptizo" to immerse.

The common version, called King James', translates the root from which the derivations Baptizo, Baptisma, Baptismos, &c., come, *dip, or dipped, dippeth*. "And he answered and said, He that *dippeth his hand* with me in the dish, the same shall betray me." Matt. 26: 23. "And he answered and said unto them, *It is one of the twelve that dippeth with me in the dish.* Mark 14: 20. "Jesus answered, He it is to whom I shall give a sop, when I have *dipped it.* And when he had *dipped* the sop, he gave *it* to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon." John 13: 26. "And he cried, and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may *dip* the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue: for I am tormented in this flame." Luke 16: 24. "And he was clothed with a vesture *dipped* in blood: and his name is called the Word of God." Rev. 19: 13.

If the root of the word is correctly translated, dip, dipped, dippeth, why not the derivations be rendered immerse, immersed, immersion, &c.?

The translations as an Anglo-Saxon definition of Greek words is not given; but the Greek words are transferred, and anglicized terminations added, instead of preserving them in the Greek form.

It is generally admitted, that immersion was practiced by the early church for the first few centuries; and that

the mode was changed, not in the days of the purity of the church, but in her degenerate and apostate condition.

The examples of baptism, as that of the Savior, of the eunuch; the practice of John; the use of language as employed by Paul, are hereby urged as arguments in favor of immersion. "And Jesus when he was baptized, *went up straightway out of the water:* and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him." Matt. 3: 16. "And John also was baptizing in Aenon, near to Salim, because there was much water there: and they came, and were baptized." John 3: 23. "And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they *went down both into the water,* both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were *come up out of the water,* the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing." Luke 8: 38, 39. "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized unto his death? Therefore we are *buried with him by baptism* into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." Romans 6: 3-5. "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." Col. 11: 12.

Objections Considered.—It is assumed that the word rendered "into," in the cases of the baptism of Christ and the eunuch, from the Greek preposition *cis* is also translated *to* and *unto*; and that they went to or unto the water.

Admitting that the word is sometimes thus rendered, and that it should

read to or unto, in these cases, it does not affect the argument in favor of immersion; for they would, of course, go to or unto the water, to be immersed in the water; and with far more propriety than to go *to* or *unto* the water for the purpose of being sprinkled *with* the water, or having some poured *upon* them. The argument does not depend so much upon the use of the words *into* or *unto*, as upon the expression of the act performed when at the water.

In the case of the eunuch, Philip baptized him. Baptized is a past participle expressive of action done. That which in this case is actively used is the person baptized. In immersion the eunuch was actively used in being applied to the water; but in sprinkling or pouring, the water would be actively used and applied to the man. The term, "Philip baptized him," would be incorrect in the latter case; but it is proper in the former case.

The preposition *into* is the commonly used translation of *eis*, and one of its primary significations. Surrounding circumstances determine too the appropriateness of this rendering in the case referred to, and we certainly should not discard valid and plain conclusions. If an incorrect translation of *eis*, could be shown, and that *into* was not a proper translation at all, there might be some show of argument, but as *into* is one of its primary renderings, this is impossible.

It is assumed that "the reason John baptized at *Aenon*, was because there were plenty of springs or fountains, so that the great multitudes who came, could have plenty to drink." To this it is replied, that there is no evidence of this being the case, but even if it were so, it would not invalidate the argument for immersion. *Aenon* was at the junction of a river with the Jordan, and therefore a place well adapted for baptismal purposes.

In a country so well watered as

Judea was, it would seem strange that John should go so far as *Aenon* to find water for the multitude to drink. His journey can be better accounted for. The banks of the Jordan, from the Sea of Tiberias to the Dead Sea, are, in many places, perpendicular cliffs; and the water ranges from six to eight feet in depth, and is often very rapid. In other places the stream is too shallow. But there were, nevertheless, several places suitable for baptism. Of these, *Aenon* was one; hence John went to *Aenon*.

II. SPRINKLING.

The word from which sprinkling is translated is "rantizo," and is nowhere rendered baptizing; and as it expresses an entirely different action, it cannot lawfully be rendered baptize, nor applied properly to the same act. It is used to signify cleansing, or purifying; and if applied to the spiritual nature of man, would indicate a purifying from sin. The advocates of sprinkling are very far from admitting that a person is cleansed from sin by the act of sprinkling. Some of them oppose the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and claim that before baptism (sprinkling) can be administered, the party must have become christians, regenerated, born anew, or again, by the converting power of the Holy Spirit. Yet the quotations so often made from Ezekiel 36: 25; Heb. 10: 22; Isaiah 52: 15, so clearly indicate a purifying or cleansing process, that it is marvellous that men cannot see the force of the word *sprinkle* in these connections. Some, however, do see, and claim that when the infant is sprinkled, it is made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.

The text in Ezekiel refers solely to the Jewish nation, and he who is to perform the sprinkling is God, not man, and as a result of this sprinkling, it is said they should be clean. It

would seem singular for a converted, sanctified or purified nation, to be cleansed by sprinkling, after they had been made pure by the power and action of the Holy Spirit as it is assumed men are to be, before baptism.

Sprinkling in Heb. 10: 22, refers to purifying, and that of the heart.

The advocates of sprinkling claim that all except infants (and some do not except them,) must be converted—born again—cleansed from sin, before they can be sprinkled. How can this sprinkling refer to the application of water to the head; if the heart is sprinkled or cleansed before by some other power? For if sprinkling here refers to water, then certainly the heart is made pure by it; but this will not be admitted. Isaiah 52: 15, refers to an act of Christ, an evident purifying of nations, by his atonement, through their obedience. Howbeit, other translations give the word *gather*, instead of *sprinkle*. "So he shall *gather* many nations, &c," which is in accordance with numerous prophecies.

How any one can hold to sprinkling and reject baptismal purification, is a mystery, for that is its evident signification, if sprinkling has reference to a form of baptism at all. See Heb. 9: 13, 19, 22; 12c 24v; I. Pet. 1: 2, where sprinkling of the blood of Christ, and under the law, the blood of animals, was for a purging or purifying purpose.

The reader should bear in mind that the advocates of sprinkling reject the main if not the only design of sprinkling, the purging away of sin.

The design in sprinkling the blood of animals was to show forth that through that means the sins of those for whom it was shed, would be forgiven, through their faith, repentance and obedience. If sprinkling with water sustains the relation to this dispensation, that sprinkling with blood did to the Jewish Church, then it follows that sins are forgiven through

that means, which believers in sprinkling will be very loth to admit.

Sprinkling of blood was the procuring cause of remission of sins, "for without the shedding of blood, is no remission." Christ shed his blood for this purpose, that through it we might be sprinkled or purified from sin. Remember it is God, who does the sprinkling of our hearts, and of the nation, and always by their obedience.

An assumption is made that the 3,000 baptized on the day of Pentecost "could not have been immersed, as time would not admit." To which we reply, that any one who understands immersing can perform the ordinance in three minutes after the preliminary exercises are attended to.

The Apostle Peter began to speak at nine o'clock A. M. or the third hour of the day; his discourse did not take more than an hour in delivery, in all probability—or till 10 o'clock. There are 20 times 3 minutes in an hour, or 20 persons an hour to each Apostle, or 240 an hour by the whole twelve—or 3,000 in about 12½ hours—or till about half past 10 o'clock at night, and in that salubrious climate, no barrier to evening services could be offered. But there were seventy other disciples of equal authority to baptize with the Twelve, making eighty-two in all—all of whom if need be, could baptize. Allowing therefore, longer time than before suggested—say five minutes to each person, or 12 in an hour, 82 multiplied by 12 equals 984 in an hour, 2952 in three hours, leaving but 48 or one each for the same number of administrators. The word says "about three thousand," so we may say that by one o'clock in the afternoon, they could have all been baptized.

While considering this theme, we will notice briefly its adjunct.

III. INFANT BAPTISM—OR SPRINKLING.

One argument employed in defence

of infant baptism, is that it is a substitution under the christian dispensation, for circumcision under the Jewish Church.

Against this assumption it is fairly urged.

FIRST.—That as circumcision was limited to one sex—*i. e.*—males, if it were a type, it would exclude female children.

SECOND.—It was a national as well as a spiritual sign.

THIRD.—It cannot be shown that baptism was introduced as an ordinance to take the place of circumcision, it is simply an assumption.

It is said that as the Abrahamic and the Christian Covenant is the same, that as children were admitted under the Abrahamic Covenant, so they should be under the Christian.

Circumcision, (Gen. 17 : 9-14) was the "token" or sign of the Abrahamic Covenant. If the Christian Covenant is the same, the same sign should continue, unless it can be shown that it was done away and sprinkling adopted in its stead—which we aver cannot be done.

We argue that this was a national sign or a token of the adoption of Gentiles into the Covenant of Abraham, which Covenant was that of the promise of the Land of Canaan for an everlasting inheritance, and also a sign that the children of Abraham, according to the flesh, are partakers of the Covenant. As the uncircumcised child was cut off from among the people; so if infant baptism takes the place of circumcision, an unchristened or unbaptized child fails to be a recipient of the blessings of Christ, or of salvation. How this conclusion can be avoided we cannot see. Yet some hold this idea, hence we have heard of "infants in hell," &c. This view is founded on the theory that baptism is essential to salvation, for if not, there is no need of infant baptism.

The Divine Master says, "Suffer

little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of heaven. Again, "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye can in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven," that is, children who have not reached the age of accountability, are held to be in a state of justification, or as not being under condemnation. "For where there is no law, there is no transgression," and "Sin is the transgression of the law." Again, "he that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." If children are totally depraved sinners, or children of wrath by nature, they must be admitted into the church of Christ, by baptism, as our infant baptizers claim. They are either made worthy of a blessing by this ordinance to which they were not entitled before, or they are not. If they are, and this blessing is membership in Christ's church, which is necessary to salvation, then baptism is essential to salvation, and infants cannot be saved without. If they are children of wrath by nature, and become children of grace when admitted to the church, and by baptism they are admitted, it follows, that baptism is the means of their conversion, or change, or regeneration from "nature to grace," and they must be thus regenerated, or born again, if the doctrine of their natural depravity, and consequent unfitness for the kingdom of God, is true; but, surprising as it may appear, the advocates of sprinkling, pouring, and some who even hold to immersion, hold, that baptism is not essential to salvation; and yet many claim that infants must be baptized, or else are not entitled to church membership. Every one who is in Christ, is certainly a member of his body; for if Christ's they are partakers of his spirit, and "by one spirit are ye all baptized into one body, *i. e.*, the church, and if any man have not the spirit of Christ he is none of his." If adult sinners must be converted and become as little

children in order to be saved, as Christ affirms, or to inherit the kingdom of heaven, why should little children be baptized?

We will briefly examine the cases cited as evidences of infant baptism: **Mark 1: 5.** "And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river Jordan." It is said that "all includes children," but all children are not infants, and these all "were baptized, confessing their sins." Could infants do this? And if so, why should John refuse to baptize them, if they could believe his preaching, and confess their sins.

Acts 16: 15: —*Lydia's household.* To the supposition that infants were included in her household, we object. First. That she was a saleswoman, and said to be of Thyatira, and if this was her home, it is not likely she would be encumbered by infants, so far from home, and while engaged in a mercantile pursuit. Her household was composed evidently of assistants or servants. Second, there is no evidence of her being a married woman, and the fact of her being engaged in business would suggest that she was unmarried. Third — Many households are composed of parents and children, all of the latter being old enough to believe and obey the gospel.

Acts 16: 33: —*The Philippian Jailor's household.* If infants were here baptized, they were old enough to rejoice and believe in God, (v. 34,) for it is just as much declared that "all his house" rejoiced and believed! as that they were baptized. The word of the Lord was preached to all that were in the house as they must believe before obedience; and no evidence is furnished of any but believers being baptized.

IV. POURING.

The advocates of this mode, obtain their main argument from some phrases that are applied to the baptism

of the Holy Spirit, where the word "pour" is used. They say therefore that as the Spirit is "poured out," "shed forth &c.," that water may be similarly applied. To this we reply; that the word *bestow* gives the full and proper idea of the baptism of the spirit, and that word is the leading definition of the Greek *ekcheo*. If the word had been *baptizo*, and it had been translated to read in Acts 11: 17, like this: "Saith God I will baptize my spirit upon all flesh, &c.," there would have been some show of argument, if it could be shown that it came upon them as water is applied in pouring; but how was the Holy Spirit poured out, or bestowed on this day, i. e., Pentecost? We read that while the church was met together, united, or "of one accord, in one place, there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting, and there appeared unto them cloven tongues as of fire, and it sat on each of them, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." **Acts 2: 2, 3, 4.** Thus was the word of John, and the promise of Christ fulfilled, and they were baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire. There came a sound—a noise, a report from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind. This was the Spirit of God, and it filled all the house," and "they were all filled." If the room was filled, and they were filled with the spirit, it looks very much more like immersion than sprinkling or pouring. Again, in **Acts 4: 31**, as before remarked, it is evident that the phrase "poured out" is the same as bestowed or given, and signifies a liberal bestowment of the spirit. Further: It is argued that the term "with water," (**Matt. 3: 11,**) would imply pouring. To this we suggest that the preposition "with" denotes the means used, and the contrast is between the baptism that John perform-

ed and that which Christ would perform. I baptize you with water—"he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." The idea of John is to show the difference in the instrument or means used in baptism. While John's work was to baptize with water, how did he baptize? Ans. In water, or "in Jordan." If sprinkling and pouring are terms interchangeable with baptism, or if they are synonymous words, or if they are proper definitions of baptism, then it should make sense to use them when reading the scriptures, instead of the word baptize, baptized, or baptism. Let us try a case or two as illustrations, for instance: Acts 19: 3, 4, 5, and use the word "pour" instead of baptize. And he said unto them, unto what then were ye poured? And they said unto John's pouring. Then said Paul, John verily poured with the pouring of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is on Christ Jesus. When they heard this they were poured in the name of the Lord Jesus. Or try the word sprinkle: Rom. 6: 4; Col. 2: 12. "Buried with him by sprinkling"—"Buried with him in pouring, &c." A singular kind of burial to stand a dead person on his feet, and sprinkle a handful of earth, or pour a cup full on his head.

The commission of Jesus to his disciples was: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them &c." The verb baptize is a transitive verb, and expresses an action passing from an agent to an object. In view of this, the thing actively used is that baptized. They were commanded to baptize men and women; they could immerse them, but could hardly sprinkle or pour them. The word baptize is always in harmony with immersion in the use of the preposition "in," but sprinkle or pour could not be followed by in, for it would not do to say that John sprinkled

or poured people in Jordan. It is proper to say sprinkle upon, or pour out of, but it would hardly read correctly to say baptize upon, or baptize out of. These remarks are based upon the idea that, if sprinkling or pouring is baptism, the words could be used interchangeably, but from the foregoing we observe that the idea is inconsistent.

V. THE SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

We need not spend much space on this part of the subject, for it is generally admitted that belief of the gospel is pre-requisite to a valid baptism, and that believers of the Gospel are proper subjects of baptism. The argument in favor of these propositions are:

The fact that "without faith it is impossible to please Him, (God) for he that cometh to God, must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." If faith is necessary to please God, and he who comes to Him, must believe in His existence we reason that a baptism not accompanied or preceded by faith would not be acceptable to God.

The words of Christ that, he that believeth, and is baptized shall be saved. Mark 16: 16. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Matt. 28: 19.

The examples found in the New Testament:

"Then they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. Acts 2: 41.

But when they believed Philip's preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women. Acts 8: 12.

And the eunuch said, "See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?" And Philip said, if thou

believest with all thine heart thou mayest." Acts 8: 36, 37.

Lydia, "whose heart the Lord opened that she attended on the things spoken of Paul, and when she was baptized and her household, &c." Acts 16: 14, 15.

"And they said, believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house, and they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes and was baptized, he and all his straightway." Acts 16: 31-33.

"And many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed and were baptized." Acts 18: 8.

The case of the Ephesians, whom Paul baptized after they had believed in the Lord Jesus. Acts 19: 1-5.

N. B.—Infants being incapable of exercising faith in the gospel, cannot lawfully be baptized; and can a baptism without faith please God?

VI. THE PRE-REQUISITES TO BAPTISM. FAITH.

We have just learned that faith is required, but faith in what?

I. *In God.*—"He that cometh to God must believe that He is—i. e.—He exists. This would seem to require then an understanding of, or belief in, his nature, as far as this can be understood from revelations. No one can believe in the existence of God, who imagines Him to be a something "without body, parts, or passions." The God of the scriptures has a body, has parts, has passions. We refer the reader to the following scriptures: Gen. 1: 26, 27, and Gen. 18, where the Lord appeared to and talked with Abraham. Gen. 35, where he appeared to Jacob. Exodus 33: 18-23, where the Lord hid Moses in the cleft of the rock, and put his hand over him, and permitted him to see his back parts, but not His face. The manifestations of passions,

as *anger*. Ezek. 5: 13, and 7: 3. *Hate*. Isa. 61: 8. *Pity*. Joel 2: 18. *Rejoicing*. Isa. 62: 5, and 65: 19. *Love*. Isa. 53: 9. Has a form. John 5: 37, and Heb. 1: 3. Jesus the express image of the Father. I. Cor. 11: 7. Man, the image of God. II. Cor. 4: 4. Christ the image, and in the form of God. Col. 1: 15, and Phil. 2: 6. His location—heaven. John 6: 36, and 17: 1; Luke 11: 2, and Acts 6: 55.

II. *His reward.*—"That He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." Heb. 11: 6. This includes, besides the belief of the fact, that of the character of the reward, which is the *remission of sins*. This requires an understanding of the manner of obtaining it, which is by faith, repentance and baptism. Acts 2: 37, 38.

The bestowment of the Holy Spirit.—Acts 2: 38, 39; John 14: 16, 17-26; 15: 26, and 16: 7-13.

The manner of bestowment.—Acts 8: 14, 19, and 19: 1-6.

The resurrection of the dead.—Luke 14: 14; John 5: 28, 29, and 6: 39, 40, 54; Acts 24: 15; Rom. 6: 5; I. Cor. 15: 21, 23, 35-54; Philippians 3: 10, 11; I. Thess. 4: 13-17; Rev. 20: 3-6.

Eternal life.—Matt. 25: 46; Luke 18: 29, 30; John 3: 15, 16, and 10: 27, 28; Rom. 2: 7, and 6: 23; Titus 1: 2; I. John 2: 25, and 7: 13; Jude 21.

The earth.—Psalm 37: 9, 11, 22, 29, 34; Matt. 5: 5.

The Kingdom of God.—Daniel 7: 27; Matt. 6: 3, and 25: 31, 34; Luke 6: 20, and 12: 32; II. Thess. 1: 5; Heb. 12: 28; James 2: 5; II. Pet. 1: 11; Rev. 3: 21.

Power or judgment over the nations.—Dan. 7: 22; I. Cor. 6: 2; Rev. 1: 6, 2: 26, 5: 10, and 20: 4; Ps. 149: 9.

III. *Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.*—Acts 16: 31. But what is it to believe on the Lord Jesus?

I. To recognize His character as the Son of God.—Acts 8: 37; John 20: 31. And here we may remark that a scriptural view of this relation of Christ to the Father must be observed. Theories, as that Jesus is the natural son of Joseph; or that He is the same being as the Father are irreconcilable with the scripture teaching. While discussing these views, and disreprieving them; we will, by the same quotations, show the true scriptural doctrine. To prove His pre-existence, and His Divine birth, please read:—John 1: 9—14; 6: 38—48, 51, 62; 7: 29; 8: 23, 40, 42, 56; 13: 3; 17: 5, 8; Heb. 11: 9, 14; I. John 1: 13.

That he is distinct from the Father. Matt. 3: 17, 11: 27; John 10: 15; 14: 28; Acts 7: 56; Heb. 1: 3; Phil. 2: 6.

II. To believe on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ is required.—See the importance of the name? Phil. 2: 9. We inquire what is the meaning of the name, His name JESUS? “Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins.” Matt. 1: 21.

It is synonymous with the name Joshua in Hebrew, signifying a Savior. “His people” evidently refers to the Jews, to them he preached, from them he chose His apostles, and to them he first sent the apostles exclusively. “Salvation is of the Jews,” and by their rejection of the offer of the kingdom and of Christ as their king, they were rejected as a nation from its blessings, as administrators of its laws and government; because of this the Gentiles are now eligible to its blessings. Rom. 11: 2, 12, 15, 19. “He came to his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name.” John 1: 11, 12.

He came to save them, i. e. the children of Israel. Matt. 15: 24. Compare Luke 19: 9, 10. He will

save them individually and nationally. Individually, by their acceptance of the terms of salvation, viz: Faith, repentance, and obedience to every command. Rom. 11: 23, 24, 25. Nationally, by restoring them to their own land. Rom. 11: 26, 27; Isa. 59: 20, 21; Ps. 14: 7; Jer. 3: 12—19; 23: 1—9; 30: 7—11; 18—21; 31: 27, 37; 32: 37, 41; 33: 14—26.

His name CHRIST, from the Greek, Christos; Hebrew, Messiah; English, anointed.

The Messiah, or the Christ, is the deliverer of Israel, the Prince of the house of David, or the heir of David's throne. Isa. 9: 6, 7; Ps. 132: 10, 11; Acts 2: 30; Luke 1: 31—33.

To believe on Jesus is, therefore, to believe in a Savior of Israel; both individually and nationally; individually by redeeming all from the curse of the law; nationally, by gathering Israel to their own land, and saving them from the power of their foes. To believe in the Christ, is to believe in the coming and reign of the Messiah on the throne of David, and in his reign over the world.

Further, to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, is to believe and trust in his authority and power, and to obey every command as he commanded, and for the purpose prescribed; and to honor his word. Acts 16: 31, 32.

III. Believing on the Lord Jesus, is to understand and believe the word of the Lord.—The word of the Lord produces faith. Rom. 10: 17. By the “word of truth” we are begotten. Jas 1: 18. Or born again. I. Peter 1: 23. It is the Gospel. I. Pet. 1: 25. The gospel is the glad tidings of the kingdom of God. Matt. 4: 23, 9; 35, 24: 14; Mark 1: 14; Luke 8: 1. Also called the “word of the kingdom,” or “good seed.” Matt. 13: 19. The kingdom of God is the Church of Christ. Daniel 2: 44. See 28. Matt. 13: 24—50; 16: 17, 18; 25: 1—

30; Luke 11: 20; 16: 16; 17: 21; Col. 1: 13.

The officers and powers of the kingdom. I. Cor. 12: 28; Eph. 4: 2-13.

The kingdom of God in its physical form is the kingdom of Israel. I. Chron. 17: 11-15; 29: 23; Luke 1: 31-33.

Also the dominion and government of the world. Dan. 7: 13, 14, 27; Psalm 11: 8, 9; Zech. 14: 9; Rev. 2: 15.

The time of its establishment as a physical kingdom. Matt. 25: 31-34; 19: 27, 28; II. Tim. 4: 1; Rev. 11: 15.

Having thus demonstrated what measure and kind of faith is essential to the validity of baptism, it is inquired, what else is necessary? We answer

VII. REPENTANCE.

But few words need be said upon this point, as none but those who deny the possibility of sinning at all, who say "there is no such thing as sin," but who admit the necessity of a "ceasing to do evil, and a learning to do well." "That the wicked man should forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts." "Repentance from dead works," is one of the principles of the doctrine of Christ. Heb. 6: 1.

Repentance comprises the sentiment of godly sorrow for sin, and a reformation of character. "Except ye be converted and become as a little child, ye can in no wise enter the kingdom of heaven," said the son of God. "Repent and be converted that your sins may be blotted out when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord," says Peter. Scripture teaching on this subject might be largely exhibited; but these will suffice, with the remark that there is certainly a grave error in the view of many, that repentance necessitates a long and intense season of bitter mourning and anguish of soul, requir-

ing days and weeks of "seeking" for forgiveness of sins.

The examples of conversion as recorded in the Acts of Apostles, certainly and unmistakeably teach that men were prepared for baptism, and "worthy" thereof immediately after they had heard, and believed the gospel.

On the day of Pentecost, about three thousand were baptized and added to the number of disciples, the "same day" that they heard, believed and repented.

The eunuch was baptized, as soon as they came to a certain water, upon confession of his faith in Jesus Christ. Acts 8th chapter.

Saul (or Paul) was baptized after three days of blindness, and doubtless of repentance. Acts 11th chapter.

Cornelius evidently was baptized as soon as he heard the gospel. Acts 10: 44-48.

Lydia also, she was baptized while at the river side, where prayer was made. Acts 16: 14.

The Philippian Jailer was baptized the same hour of the night, that he believed. Acts 16th chapter.

The twelve men whom Paul baptized at Ephesus, obeyed immediately upon hearing Paul's preaching.

From these we learn that the doctrine of some that a "Christian experience" must be had before baptism has no support from the word of God, for not only do these examples of conversion show otherwise, but we hold there is no "thus saith the Lord" that it is required, and therefore may safely be set down, as one of the "traditions of men," which are taught for the doctrine of Christ, by which the law is made void, and instead of a long period of waiting to prove whether the believer has truly repented, and obtained an experience of the forgiveness of sins, and reception of the spirit of God; instead of this we say, they were commanded to be baptized, and even to

make no unnecessary delay, which doubtless would have caused the tradition-teachers, and formalists of the day, to be filled with pious indignation at the unseemly haste. The Pentecostians were baptized the same day. The eunuch, as soon as water convenient could be found, which happened while they were journeying along, and the gospel was being taught him.

Ananias seemed to be impressed that Paul should be in a hurry to obey the gospel, for he said: "And now why tarriest thou, arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Acts 12th chapter.

VIII. DESIGN OR OBJECT OF BAPTISM.

I. By it the believer puts on Christ,—"For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ," (Gal. 3: 26, 27,) and thus becomes a new creature—"for if any man be in Christ he is a new creature." The same idea is also taught in Rom. 6: 3-5; Col. 2: 12.

II. By it, in connection with a proper faith and repentance sins are remitted.—The convicted and believing Jews on the day of Pentecost were commanded by Peter thus: "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," accompanied with the assurance that they should receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. Acts 2: 38, 39.

Ananias declared to Paul that he should "arise and be baptized, and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Acts 22: 16. Plain as this language is, yet there are a vast number of persons professing to believe the word of God, who object to it, and endeavor to destroy its force and application, by giving it a signification that nothing short of a complete alteration of the whole language would warrant. Thus of the texts in Acts 2, it is said, that the Apostle meant that they should

repent for remission of sins, and be baptized because of remission. If that is what he meant, he certainly could express himself in that way; and all efforts to contort the original; all criticism, and efforts to find a warrant for a different translation are as yet in vain, for it stands "repent and be baptized for remission of sins;" and by all known and recognized rules of grammar governing such a case, remission of sins is predicated upon repentance and baptism. Repent and be baptized says the Apostle; and if baptism is administered because of "sins remitted, so is repentance for the same purpose; as they both are joined together as a means to a certain end. And it would seem strange that a person should repent because his sins are forgiven.

But, says the objector, how can baptism wash away sins? "How can the act of going into the water wash away the sins of the soul?"

We might reply in a few words, like this, that it matters not to any who really believe the Bible to be the word of God, how it is done, if the scriptures require it, and if they do not mean what they say, when speaking so plainly, and no figurative language connected with it whatsoever, where can we find anything that means what it says? Where is this system of interpreting—or we might with more propriety say, misinterpreting the word of God, to end?

What condition of things would obtain in this country, if the Constitution of the United States was treated in this manner. A score of interpreters would each give his view of its meaning, and how he thinks it should be understood, and that to suit his own private ends or the purposes of his party. How could its objects be carried out, and its principles enforced? For not more than one in twenty would accept the interpretation put upon the instrument by the executive officers, and would rebel, or perhaps secede and set up in-

dependent governments based on the principles of "my policy."

But to return; the difficulty with many, is owing to the fact, that while they accept theories or doctrines that are at the most, dependent upon inferences, and of an unreasonable, and mysterious character, they cannot accept baptism as a condition of forgiveness of sin, because they cannot see how it is done, or the mode of operation; cannot understand the relation between cause and effect, notwithstanding the ever present truth that God has commanded the duty, and promised the blessing. If this style of argument (if worthy of the name) is valid, and was acted upon in other ages of the world, it would have made necessary a new creation of men and animals. For had Noah reasoned, (as theologians do?) and had concluded that some other size and form of the ark, or other material for construction than that given by God would do, or had doubted the adaptation of the means to the end, he and his family would have found a common grave with the Antediluvian world. Or if the Israelites, serpent bitten and dying, would have reasoned upon the probability or improbability of virtue being manifested by a brazen serpent, and inquired into the philosophical relation between looking thereat and the healing of the bite of live ones, and found that simple "looking at a brazen serpent possessed no curative powers as they could discover from medical treatises, nor in strict accordance with the laws of Therapeutics, nor based upon any known principle of the materia medica, and therefore impracticable and absurd, they would have perished as a reward for the exercise of learned argumentations. Again, the Syrian leper came near remaining a victim of a loathsome disease, because he failed to perceive any particular virtue in being washed in Jordan. His own Damascene Rivers were as good and better, his humbler servant, and we may

say therefore more discerning, said, that simple obedience and trust was the operative cure, and humbly, yet appropriately remarked, if "some great thing" had been required he would have done it. So, to-day, the proud human heart demands an effort that savors of merit for good works, rather than obedience to a humiliating ordinance, and learned teachers talk of "impropriety," and "indecency." The ever to be remembered testimony of God in regard to Noah is, "That in all things whatsoever God commanded Noah, so did he."

What saved the Israelites from the serpent's deadly bite? Faith and obedience. They believed the brazen serpent was there; they believed if they looked they would live, simply because God commanded them to look, and pledged them salvation if they did, and thus believing they obeyed, or looked and were healed.

So of baptism for the remission of sins. God commands the believer of the gospel to repent and be baptized. He obeys, thus honors God's word, by simple childlike faith and trust and obedience. God honors him according to promise and forgives his sins.

It was obedience to God, and trust in his promises that saved the first born of the children of Israel from the destroying angel, through the sprinkling of blood on the door posts and lintels of the houses. Could not God have saved them some other way? Yes, if he had chosen to do so, but he did as he willed, and required them to obey his will, not their own. So baptism saves us, by our faith and obedience. The terms of reconciliation are his own; we are the rebels, and he has the sole right to dictate the terms by which we may partake of his clemency and favor. Or, if we refuse to comply, he has the right and may exercise it, to permit us to take the benefit of our stubbornness, and reap the consequences of disobedience. Even

to fulfilling in us, the truth that "he that knoweth his master's will, and doeth it not, shall be beaten with many stripes."

III. Baptism forms an essential part in the work of regeneration, and of entrance into the kingdom of God. John 3:5; Titus 3:5; Eph. 5:26.

IV. God is justified, by the peoples obedience to this ordinance. Luke 8:20.

V. The counsel of God is rejected by not obeying. Luke 7:30.

VI. The baptism of John, and that of Christ and the Apostles, is the same in faith that precedes, and the object thereof.

The kingdom of God was preached by all. Matt. 3:2; 4:17; 10:7; Luke 4:43; 8:1; 9:2; Acts 19:8; 20:23.

Repentance also. Matt. 3:2; Mark 1:14, 15; Luke 24:47; Acts 2:38; 3:19.

Baptism for remission of sins. Mark 1:4, 5; 16:15, 16; Luke 24:47; compare with Acts 1:8, and 2:38.

The phrase "christian baptism" as used in contradistinction to John's baptism is like many more sentiments, unscriptural and uncalled for. It is brought into existence by the assumption that the "christian dispensation" (another unscriptural phrase,) began after the resurrection of Christ, or on the day of Pentecost, and that the gospel began to be preached on that day. But we read in Mark 1:1. "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the son of God," and the following record clearly shows, that the preaching and baptism of John was the beginning of the gospel. If John's preaching and baptism was the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, then it was as much "christian baptism" as that performed on the day of Pentecost.

Some assume that the gospel, i. e. Christ's death, burial and resurrection, was not preached till the day of Pentecost. True, not as accomplished facts.

But as prophetic truth, as a coming reality it was. Christ taught it, and John evidently understood it; for he said when Jesus was coming to be baptized, "Behold the lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world." It was the gospel before its accomplishment, it was the gospel afterward; and indeed it may be urged that there was more virtue in believing that he should die and rise again, than to believe he did die and rise again, according to Paul's definition of faith in Heb. 11:1.

That "faith is the substance (ground or confidence—margin, or assurance—other translations) of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." And the Savior's declaration to Thomas after he had put his finger in the nail prints, &c., "Because thou hast seen thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, yet have believed."

To believe in that which many eyewitnesses can testify to, is not so meritorious as to believe in that which a few declare will be, and which exists as prophecy, not as history. That the prophets understood this matter and believed it, is evident from I. Pet. 1:10, 11; Isa. 53.

It is a gospel truth that baptism is for remission of sins, before a person is baptized. It was gospel when Peter declared it on the day of Pentecost. It was gospel after some had obeyed and obtained the promise. To say that the gospel cannot be preached, until it is preached as facts, is unreasonable and contrary to facts. The baptism of John, we then assume, was, for the reasons given, a gospel baptism. The difference between his authority and that of the Apostles seems to be, that John was an Aaronic Priest; and not having the authority to lay on hands for the gift of the Holy Spirit, it was not given, as an abiding comforter and teacher, while Christ was on earth. John 7:39. The Apostles held a higher Priesthood; and after receiving a baptism of the Spirit—could, and did

impart it to others by the laying on of hands; evidently recognizing the validity of John's baptism, for we do not read that they were baptized again, or any others who were baptized of John. There is no proof that the twelve whom Paul baptized were administered to by John. But the reverse; for John assured those that he baptized, that they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost and fire, which was fulfilled on all who remained faithful—on the day of Pentecost.

We can fitly close this part of the subject, by the statement of Paul to the Ephesians, 4 : 4, 5. "There is one body, and one spirit, even as ye are called, in one hope of your calling: one Lord; one faith; one baptism; one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."

This one body is the church of Christ, organized, and in active operation, properly officered, and empowered to act; as illustrated in I. Cor. 12 : 28.

And God hath set some in the church: first, apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, teachers; after that, miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues. And perfected, prepared to work, and edified by "apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers." Eph. 4 : 11, 13. A perfect and well organized building. Eph. 4 : 16.

This "one baptism" cannot refer to once being immersed, whether it was done by proper authority or not, or for the designated purpose: for Paul baptized some who had been immersed unto John's baptism, that is, in all probability, in the form of John, but not by John, for reasons before given. See Matt. 3 : 11. Paul did not recognize it. If it had been performed by John, he would. There is no evidence that the Apostles themselves were baptized after they had been by John, for some of them were baptized by him,

and probably all. John 1 : 35-42. John's baptism being the "counsel of God," (Luke 7 : 30), and manifestation of righteousness which is revealed through the gospel. Rom. 1 : 17.

The "one baptism" is that of immersion, preceded by a faith in "the things of the kingdom and the name of Jesus Christ," "for remission of sins," and performed by one having authority; for we remark in conclusion, that the ordinance must be performed by one properly authorized.

IX. PERFORMED IN THE NAME OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST.

Peter commanded to "repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. Acts 2 : 38. "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Acts 10 : 48. "They were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." 8 : 16. "When they heard this they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." 19 : 5. The above, and similar passages, evidently refer to the authority of the Lord Jesus.

The only argument we have heard against this phraseology is, that the word *in* should be rendered *into*; for, says the party urging this correction, "*in* signifies by the authority of," tacitly admitting that they hold no authority to act in the name of the Lord Jesus. Suppose we apply this rule to a few passages where a similar phrase is used; for instance, Matt. 7 : 22. How would it read. "Lord have we not prophesied *into* thy name, and *into* thy name cast out devils, and *into* thy name done many wonderful works." Or Acts 16 : 18. "But Paul being grieved, turned and said to the spirit, I command thee *into* the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her.

The disciples were commanded to preach, heal the sick, cast out devils, baptize, &c., in the name of Christ. This is admitted by all. But how were they authorized to preach, baptize,

&c.? Ans. By Divine appointment. They were either personally commissioned by the Savior, or called by his Spirit in prophecy; or by prophets, as Paul and Barnabas were called. Acts 13 : 1, 2, 3, 4; also Timothy. I. Tim. 4 : 1, 18.

To assume this authority will not do, for it may be asked in the great day of decisions, who hath required this at your hands? Some will say in that day, "Lord, Lord have we not prophesied in thy name, &c., &c." But the response will be, "I never knew you," (or recognized you,) or as otherwise translated, "you never knew me."

To assume the responsibility of acting in the name of Jesus without due and demonstrable authority, is certainly an act of daring assumption. For men to claim that they are "ambassadors of Christ," authorized to adopt men and women into his kingdom, and give them power over the property and goods of their master; without justifying that claim, by preaching and practicing as the Apostles of old, and organizing his kingdom as they did, with the same evidence of their acceptance by their master by the reception of his Spirit, in the signs following the believer. For men to claim this position, and yet their teaching and practice falsifying their claim, is no child's play; nor will the Lord "hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain."

Who can claim a call to the ministry as Paul, Barnabas and Timothy; or by direct command of Christ, as the twelve and the seventy. A man has as good a right to take the call to Noah to build an ark—and commence to build one also; or Abraham's call to go into a strange country to receive it for an inheritance, and leave home and friends and go to some distant land for the same purpose; or Moses' call to leave the children of Israel, and go to Cuba, and lead the slaves out of Spanish bondage, as men have to take the New Testament record of a certain

commission, given to certain men, and fulfilled by them, and apply it to themselves to-day.

Yet those that do this neither preach nor practice as they did, nor labor as they did without purse and scribe; but settle down as salaried teachers over rich and popular ease-loving congregations, and twice or thrice a week read an essay, in rosewood or marble pulpits; praised by the masses, petted and caressed by the nobility, having their reward from those they serve, even the friendship of the world. O the painful, saddening contrast between these and the hungry, foot-sore, poverty-stricken, hated and hunted, bonded and beaten, insulted and imprisoned, mocked and murdered preachers of a pure, uncorrupted gospel 1800 years ago.

But what are the *calls* of to-day? One is called by a "small still voice;" another "heard a voice calling him to preach;" a third is called by a "dream;" a fourth, by a "Sense of duty to help save souls;" a fifth, by "advice of friends;" a sixth, by "vote of conference" or "synod;" a seventh, by "law;" but who by the voice of God through a living prophet?

And to what are they called? To preach this ism, and that, to build up this church, and that, differing in faith, practice, and church order, as widely as extremes can be. For instance, one is called to preach that "a portion of mankind never will be saved;" another, that "all may be saved;" a third, that "all will be saved." Did God call men to teach all this? If so, can it all be true? If all men will be saved, is there any who never will be? No difficulty there, says a friend, for God never called any one to teach that all will be saved. No trouble at all, says another friend, for God never called any one to teach unconditional election and reprobation, or that some never would be saved. "I say he did," says the first, "I say he did'nt," replies the other. But hold, the scriptures

say the "servant of the Lord must not strive," and Christ says a kingdom divided against itself cannot stand. Again, another comes forward claiming that God sent him to preach the gospel, and to declare that "sprinkling is the gospel baptism." Nay, says another, "pouring is the Divinely appointed mode." You both are wrong, says the third, for I am sent to declare that "immersion alone is the true plan." And "I affirm that all three are right," says a fourth, and one is as good as the other. And I, "as confidently cries a fifth, affirm that neither is right, for water is not required at all, the baptism of the Spirit is the essential baptism."

Did God call them all? If not, which one? and as all give the same evidence, who can decide that one is not as much called as the other? If he called them all, and of course commissioned all, and each and all act in his name, do not his laws conflict? Are not his servants antagonistic, and his kingdom divided? and if so, will it stand? There is "one faith," says the Apostle. Is Calvinism a faith? Certainly it is. Is it the one faith? "Yes" says the Calvinist. Well is Arminianism a faith? Yes. Is it the one faith? "Yes," says the Arminian. Again, is Universalism a faith? "Yes." Is it the one faith? "Yes," says the Universalist. But how can they all be the one faith, when they disagree on about every point? Perhaps this is another "Trinity." "Three in one, and one in three," we add, yet with each other none agree.

If God called Mr. C—, to declare that adults alone are subjects of baptism, who called Mr. P—, to assert as gospel truth that infants must also be baptized. If God is unchangeable, in whom is no variableness or shadow of turning, why has he inspired different men to contradict each other and teach different faiths, and gospels as the foundation of their faith; and to divide

his kingdom, and frustrate the desire of his Son who prayed that his disciples might be one, that the world might believe that God has sent him.

These thoughts ought not to be laid aside with a sneer, nor be laughed at, and forgotten. Thinking men and women, will ponder these things, and inquire where is the trouble? and if it would not bring upon our head the execration of the kingdom of the clergy, we might whisper in their ears, that perhaps the trouble may be with the call. An issue seems to be presented, that we must reflect on the wisdom and character of God, or question the divine authority of the call. On one side, we endanger our salvation, as we begin to tread the road to Atheism; on the other hand, we may receive the anathemas of all we may thus question—and who is not included? We ask, "By what authority thou doest these things, and who gave thee this authority?" We are answered. Those who ordained us, or the conference, or synod, or association. But who gave them the authority to ordain, or set you apart to the ministry? And we are answered. Those who ordained them. It is resolved into this proposition: Mr. M's. authority to preach, baptize, ordain, &c., comes by virtue of being ordained, by regularly ordained men, who were in their turn regularly ordained, by regularly ordained men, till we trace it back to the source of all authority of this kind, Jesus. But hold a moment. A line of Apostolic succession is established, and is that a truth? If so, does this line run outside of, or independent of the "Mother Church of Rome, and if true, when has this discovery been made? If not outside of her, then inside or through her; and we humbly ask does she, or did she at the time of Luther's secession hold valid authority from Jesus Christ, or his Apostles as the true church? If she did, then Luther and his associates, and all other dis-

senters, are apostates from the true church; and furthermore, have lost all authority received from her; for if she held valid authority, she had the "keys of the kingdom," with power to bind and unbind, and she certainly has excommunicated Luther and all others, and took back all the powers conferred on them by her.

Was there any other church in existence that was the true church if she was a false one, to whom Luther could go, and get authority if he obtained none from her, as he could not, if she was false and corrupt as the protestant world affirm? If there was such a church, why did not Luther attach himself to it, and get authority instead of laying the foundation of a new church? If there was no such church; and the church of Rome the only church—pretending even to be the church of Christ, where did he get his ordination after it was nullified by the powers that first gave it? And if she was, and is a false and corrupt church, as protestants assert, what authority that God would sanction, could she confer on Luther or any one else? If she was the true church of Christ, she must have been properly organized, indeed perfectly organized, and in possession of a full and perfect faith; (or she could not be the true church;) and if she was thus organized, how could Luther and others reform her faith and practice. If they could reform her, or institute reforms, then she was not the true church of Christ, for that is a perfect organization as before shown. See I. Cor. 12; Eph. 4. If she was a fallen, and apostate church, where is her authority to represent the doctrine of Christ. If she became a harlot then she was divorced from her husband, Christ; for his bride is pure and without spot or blemish. If she becomes otherwise, then he casts her off, and of course she cannot hold his name, nor represent him in any sense. How a corrupt tree can bring forth

good fruit, or a corrupt unchaste woman or church, can bring forth a legitimate and pure child, is to be demonstrated by others. Please read Rev. 17, and 18. Further, if these men were authorized by some divine power outside of the church itself, to reform her faith and practice, why did they not restore her or themselves to the primitive faith and order of the church? Why did not the effects named in Mark 16:17, 18, follow the preaching? Further, if they did not restore these things, and their departure from them as in the case of the church of Rome, is an evidence of apostacy and corruption, as the present state of affairs is the same as when Luther began his work as far as the absence, of the spiritual gifts, and apostles, prophets, &c., and the apostolic practice of baptism, and laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Spirit, is concerned; has there not been another Apostacy since Luther's reorganization of the Apostolic church? (admitting that he did reorganize it, which no one claims.) If Luther restored the true apostolic faith, and practice, and church-order, then which ever of the hundreds of religious parties manifest that faith, and practice and order, and is in possession of those spiritual gifts, ever attendant upon the true church, then it is the church of Christ, and holds solely and alone authority, to administer the ordinances of the true church. Where is the church? If Luther did not restore the ancient faith and order, did he re-establish the kingdom of God. If he did where is it? If he did not, who did? Or is it restored? Or was it never lost, but continued on down uncorrupted in faith and government till now?

If Luther or any one else was authorized to establish a church not after the original pattern, did he receive a "revelation" from God as to how much of the original faith he was to preach, and how much of the

original practices he was to restore, or to change their form and intention altogether; and how many of the old officers, and spiritual powers he was to retain, and how many to lay aside, and what new officers to chose, and the new name he was to give the organization? If he did not receive a "new revelation" where did he find any such warrant to do as has been done? If he did receive such new revelations, then has God ceased to reveal himself, or speak to the children of men since John the Revelator? If it "pleased" God to put certain members, or officers and powers in his church, once, has it since displeased him? If so is he unchangeable? If it has not displeased him, does it please him for men to institute new and different order of things and without revelation? It is claimed by some, that baptism, i.e immersion for remission of sins in the name of Jesus is valid baptism, upon profession of faith that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. We ask such, is immersion, as "an outward sign of inward grace," or because that sins are remitted—i.e.—not for remission, but simply immersion, valid. If so, why then insist on the former alone? If the latter is not valid, then those who were so baptized, are not lawfully baptized, and if so, are not baptized at all. If so, and a baptism performed by an unbaptized person is not valid, and there was a time when baptism was not performed for remission, then the first one baptized for remission was not lawfully baptized, inasmuch as the one who baptized him was not baptized for remission, and to trace the matter further, can gospel Gal. 1:8

Errata.—On page 13, prop. IV, instead of "Luke 8:20," it should read Luke 7:29; and on page 17, 13th line from top, right hand column, leave out word "not;" 14th line read the departure instead of "their departure."

any run immersion back to the apostles uninterrupted? If not, then there was a time when sprinkling and pouring alone was practiced. If so, the first one immersed was so administered to by an unimmersed or sprinkled party. Was that baptism valid? If a fountain dried up cannot send forth a stream, can the baptisms even of immersion, and for remission of sins, be valid, coming from such a powerless source. If it does not require that baptism or immersion be performed by a properly baptized person, then of course it matters not who performs it, whether saint or sinner? Yes, says one, "it must be a christian." But who is a christian? It is replied a follower of Christ, one who keeps his commands. Well is an unbaptized person a follower of Christ, one who keeps Christ's commands. Certainly not. Well then, baptism must be performed by a baptized person after all, and we ask our friends who hold to immersion alone, to the exclusion of all other forms, can immersion be traced to the Apostles without interruption or not? If not, then the first case after it ceased to be practiced in the few centuries after Christ—must have been performed by a party who himself must have been sprinkled and according to your faith, an unbaptized man. If the true gospel order was lost, could it be restored short of divine appointment? And may not the angel who brings the everlasting gospel (Rev. 14:6), to preach to them who dwell on the earth, restore the ancient order, and authorize men to preach and baptize as formerly, and if he has not come, will he not come? Will he bring the same or another