

Given by Wm. C. Wilkinson
W
Gen. Lib.
EL

Base S. S.
Library No 131

Class

Book

University of Chicago Library

GIVEN BY

William C. Wilkinson

Besides the main topic this book also treats of

Subject No.

On page

Subject No.

On page



THE
BIBLE BAPTIST,

No. I,

OR,

WHAT DOES THE BIBLE SAY ON THE
MODE OF BAPTISM?

BY

THOMAS P. HUNT,

Author of the Bible Baptist, No. II; or, Who does the
Bible say must be Baptized?

He, (the Word of God) was clothed in a vesture, dipped, (baptized)
in blood.—Rev. xix. 13.

Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel?—Is. lxiii. 2.

Their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments.—Is. lxiii. 4.

Revised and Enlarged.

NEW-YORK:
M. W. DODD
59 CHAMBERS STREET.
1857.

Y D A S 3 1 1
T O 7 0 0
W A S H I N G T O N

BV 811

H 9

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1846, by

M. W. D O D D,

In the Clerk's Office for the Southern District of New York.

THOMAS B. SMITH, STEREOTYPY,
216 WILLIAM STREET, N. Y.

234523

P R E F A C E .

THE author of this little work, first published it at the request of the Synod of North Carolina. It has found great favor among those who desire to be wise according to what is written in the Scriptures. It has also been a favorite theme for review and attack by others. The author has received reviews of it from the North, East, South and West. The old editions, numerous as they have been, are all exhausted, and the loud and numerous calls for a fresh supply, occasion this new edition. It is given to the public with the sincere desire that all who read it may be baptized into the Lord Jesus, by that Holy Spirit by which we are baptized into one body.

BIBLE BAPTIST.

Sprinkler. I understand that the communion of the Lord's Supper is to be administered in your church, and that you have invited the members of sister churches to unite with you, on that occasion. I wish to enjoy that privilege.

Immerser. To what church do you belong?

S. As Christ only died for me, I would, in remembering him, forget all other names; and rejoice with all who love him, to show forth his death. But you may call that "branch of the true Vine" on which I bring forth my fruit, the thorough-going BIBLE BAPTIST church.

Im. Then you believe in Baptism?

S. I believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. And I regard baptism as of divine command, binding on all who are fit subjects of the kingdom of heaven.

Im. You have then obeyed it?

S. Yes; on a profession of faith, after I was thirty years old.

Im. Brother, I am glad to meet with you, and do most cordially invite you to the table of *your* Lord. For we immersers are opposed to "close communion." But will you permit me to see your letters?

S. Certainly. Here is my certificate.

Im. (*After reading.*) I am sorry that I cannot recognize you as belonging to the Church of Christ.

S. Is not my certificate a good one? Is not the Presbyterian church, a church of Christ?

Im. Presbyterians do not hold with believers' baptism.

S. Indeed they do. They believe, that the promise is to believers and to their seed, and that none but believers can claim the privileges and use of this seal of the covenant. They require that believers and their household should be baptized, according to the practice of the Apostles in obedience to the command of Jesus. As Lydia and her household, Acts xvi. 15. The jailer and all his, Acts xvi. 33. The household of Stephanos, 1 Cor. i. 16. You do not require half as much baptism as we do. Therefore I said you might call mine the *thorough-going* BIBLE BAPTIST CHURCH.

Im. You know that there is but one door into the sheepfold. And he that enters not in at the door,

but climbeth up some other way, is a thief and a robber. Baptism is the door into the church.

S. Christ is the door. And he who enters in by him shall be saved, and none other. Do you not believe that some presbyterians have thus entered and will be saved?

Im. Certainly.

S. Then they cannot be thieves and robbers; for none such can enter heaven. They must have entered in by the right way; which is not by a mode of baptism, but by repentance for sin, faith in the Lord Jesus, and newness of life.

Im. I sincerely believe that there is but one *baptism*. Presbyterians do not believe this. Therefore I am compelled to reject them.

S. Indeed Presbyterians do hold, that there is but one baptism. They never rebaptize.

Im. I believe that the mode is essential to baptism, or that the mode and baptism is the same thing. And can prove that there is but one mode, Eph. iv. 5, one Faith, one Lord, one Baptism.

S. The Bible does not say, one mode of baptism, but, one baptism. I believe in but *one* baptism; the Christian baptism with water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. What more would you require of me?

Im. If there is but one baptism, I suppose that there can be but one mode.

S. It is not worth while to talk about suppositions. If the Bible is silent about it, have we the right to say that a man is disobedient who believes in baptism, because he cannot agree with us about that which neither he nor we can find in the Bible ?

Im. Our church has determined that there is but one mode, and that none shall commune with us, nor we with them, unless they believe as we do on this subject. But we are not close communists, we throw the door wide open. You shut it against yourself. Believe as we do, and come in and welcome. Besides you treat others in the same way, and will not let them join your church unless they adopt your creed.

S. True, we do not receive into church *membership*, such as reject our doctrines. But we do admit to church *fellowship* all who believe in the Lord Jesus and follow him, although they may not desire to become members of our church. I am not seeking to become a member of your church, but only demanding access to the table of our Lord. If I am his, he is mine, and I have a right to his covenant gifts wherever I find them.

Im. I have often felt that it would be pleasant

and profitable to me, to commune with others
But as I am bound not to wound the feelings of
my brethren, I have always refused to join in
communion with other denominations.

S. Are not all our brethren for whom Christ died? Is there no danger of wounding the feelings of a large number of them, by unchuraching them; denying the validity of their ministry and ordinances; refusing them Christian communion; and, in this respect, treating them as publicans and sinners, while you cannot show the least authority for it from the word of God? But you said, that you sometimes felt like communing with us. Who shut the door against you? Did we not open it wide, and invite you in, not as a member of our church, but as, what is far better, a member of Christ? Did you not shut it yourself, against yourself, as you do against us?

Im. Brother, you are too hard upon us. We do not deny that Presbyterians are ministers of Christ. We are happy to labor with them as such, and do it.

S. Yes; just in the same way that you would labor with any private Christian, but in no other. Do you acknowledge their right to administer the ordinances of Christ? Will you receive them at their hands? Do you not rebaptize those that

they have baptized? Will you administer the ordinance of the Eucharist to them? None but ministers have a right to administer these ordinances. Will you permit us, invite us, either to administer or to partake of them? Certainly not. And yet, denying us our rights, and forbidding when you can do it, even our wives and children to commune with us as ministers or Christians, you say, we are too hard in charging this upon you. What more could you do to deny the validity of our ministry, and our title to the covenant of Christ's salvation? Do you not believe that God blesses the ministry of Presbyterians, and trains up in that church many shining lights, with whom you hope to commune in heaven?

Im. Yes; but we must wait until we get to heaven, before we can distinguish between the ignorance and disobedience which God may forgive, and that which seems, to us, to be an open violation of his law.

S. We are taught to pray: Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. If God will commune with us in heaven, and does it now on earth, how can you refuse to do it now, while you know you will have to do it in heaven? Modes make no difference with God, neither on earth nor in heaven. Why should they with men? We must

not call nor treat that as common, or unclean, which God the Father has cleansed, Acts x. 5.

Im. I would like to change the subject. I am bound to contend for the faith. I can prove baptism must always be performed by immersion, and that nothing but immersion is baptism. And, that unless a person is immersed, he is not baptized.

S. How will you do it?

Im. First from the meaning of the word in the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Dutch, and other dictionaries.

S. I am not acquainted with all these languages. Can you tell me who made these dictionaries. Were they holy men, inspired by God, full of the Holy Spirit. Or were they heathens, ignorant of even the first principles of Revelation?

Im. Some of them may have been good men. None of them were inspired. And many of them were unacquainted with the truths of Revelation, and were infidels, heathens, and pagans.

S. I have heard good and learned men, on both sides, contend that the dictionaries were in their favor. God, however, has not commanded me to search the dictionaries, but the Scriptures, for a knowledge of his will. They were recorded by

holy men, God speaking unto them by the Holy Spirit. But how are dictionaries made?

Im. Learned men read and study a language. They find out what meaning those who use a language, give to its words. They then write down the word, and give the meaning of it as used by the natives, giving the most learned of their authors as authority.

S. You mean that a good dictionary-maker always refers to the works of a man for authority that he used a word with a certain meaning.

Im. Yes; that is what constitutes a valuable dictionary.

S. The men then who make a dictionary from the Bible must always be able to show that the inspired penmen used the word in a certain way, and can refer to different passages in their works and in proof of the definition?

Im. Most certainly.

S. It would not be a good dictionary which attempted to prove what meaning Paul attached to a word, by proving from the works of Homer, that Homer used the word with that meaning?

Im. Certainly not. He must prove from Paul's own words, Paul's meaning.

S. Well then, can you furnish me with a dictionary that gives me chapter and verse from the

Bible, so that I may know with what meaning or usage the inspired writers employed the word baptism ?

Im. Yes ; they always used it in reference to immersion, plunging ; as when a person holding a heavy weight lets it fall into the water, and it sinks entirely under.

S. I know that is what Cox and Carson say it means. But they have, with much truth, said : Mere speculation here is of no value—that theories and conjectures with respect to a subject that concerns the faith and the obedience of God's people, is of no authority. We must have plain proof by positive declaration, or fair inference, that thus saith and thus doeth the Lord, before we can admit it as God's word. If he has written it, it is in the Bible, and we can find it.

Im. I perfectly agree with you ; and will prove from the Bible usage of the words Baptize and Baptism, that they always refer to some act or thing plunged, immersed, until entirely covered over, and never to anything that is sprinkled or poured upon. And consequently, that cannot be baptism which is not plunging, nor baptized which is not plunged. I will give you a few cases that will settle the question at once.

S. A few cases will not do. You must prove it

in all and in every case. I acknowledge that the heathen employ the word baptize, sometimes, to mean immersion by plunging. But I deny what you assert, and are bound to prove, either that the heathen never used it with any other meaning—and that such is its unvarying or even general meaning or usage among the sacred writers. If I can prove that the sacred writers used the word, in reference to acts performed by pouring and sprinkling, you will be defeated?

Im. Certainly.

S. I do not believe that God attaches any value to modes or forms. It is the obedience of the heart in the thing done, and not the mode of doing it, that is acceptable to him. Water applied in any way, in the name of the Trinity, by a proper person to a fit subject, is, valid baptism. I have therefore no wish to deny that you have been baptized: nor to withhold from you Christian fellowship and privileges, as though you were disobedient. This is the charge you bring against me. And as it induces you to banish me from my Saviour's table, I owe it to myself, before I silently consent to be treated as an alien and unbeliever, to make my defence.

Im. I have often wondered how so many learned and pious men, as I know to be among

Presbyterians, can have any doubt as to the duty of being plunged in water. And it does really pain me to debar them from our communion. I am anxious to hear your defence—especially as you do not attack the validity of our church.

S. If I understand you, one of your strongest reasons for believing that plunging is necessary to baptism, is, that the words *baptize and baptism* in the original Greek, mean, *to plunge, to immerse* the whole thing entirely under water. And that Jesus and his disciples did thus plunge, and we are bound to follow their practice.

Im. Certainly this is our strong defence.

S. Suppose I admit that Jesus was plunged, could you prove from that, that no other mode is valid? We know exactly how another ordinance, equally important and divine, was administered by Jesus and the Apostles. Do you pretend to say, that unless all partake of the supper after the manner set by the Saviour, it is invalid?

Im. By no means. And none of us pretend to administer the Lord's Supper after the mode that Jesus did it.

S. How do you then prove that the pattern in one case is to be followed, and not in the other?

Im. Because the word *baptism* means *plunging*.

S. If I understand you, you mean that as the

Saviour used a word in instituting the ordinance of baptism that means to plunge, he intended that that should be the only mode.

Im. Such is my meaning.

S. If it had been the intention of Jesus to confine the ordinance to one mode, and there was one word in the language he used, that always, both figuratively and primarily, signified or pointed out that mode, you think that he would have used that word?

Im. Certainly. And as baptism does signify to plunge, and he has used that word, I think we are bound to follow that meaning.

S. There is a word that was in common use among the Jews, and occurring very frequently in the Greek of the Old Testament, which never signifies anything else but immersion, either figuratively or literally. (Kataduno.) You will find it in Exodus xv. 5. Pharaoh's chariots and his hosts hath he cast into the sea.—The depths have covered them; they *sank* into the bottom as a stone. They were plunged. Also Jeremiah li. 63, 64. Thou shalt bind a stone to the book, and cast it into the midst of Euphrates; and thou shalt say, thus shall Babylon *sink* (be plunged). The word for *sink* in the original is never used to mean anything else but total immersion, as a heavy

weight falling into the water is entirely covered. If total immersion had been the binding rule, the Saviour would have used that word. But he never used it, nor does it, I think, ever occur in the New Testament. Now tell me, if you can, why this definite, unvarying word for plunging is avoided, and another of various meanings employed, if the Saviour intended to make the mode essential?

Im. I contend that baptize has only one meaning in the Bible usage of the term.

S. I know you do. And I am willing to be judged by the Bible usage of the term. I can prove to you that things are said to be baptized, which were not (catadunized) plunged, but were rantized, sprinkled, or poured, that is, not by immersion, but by affusion. Acts i. 5. Jesus says, John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence. John before had said, Matt. iii. 11, that Jesus should baptize with the Holy Ghost. What language does prophecy use in relation to the baptism of the Holy Ghost? Does it ever speak of plunging, immersing, in the Holy Ghost? It speaks plainly, and never intimates anything of the kind. Let us hear Is. xlv. 3. I will pour out my Spirit upon thy seed. Joel ii. 28. I will

pour out my Spirit on all flesh. Is. xxxii. 29 ; until the Spirit be poured out. Ezek. xxxix. 29. For I have poured out my Spirit. Does the New Testament ever say, that they were ever plunged, immersed, in the Holy Spirit? Not the darkest hint is ever given that this was ever done. Matt. iii. 16. When Jesus was baptized, the Spirit descended, (Luke iii. 22) in bodily shape, like a dove upon him. John xx. 22. Jesus breathed upon them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. From these prophecies and their fulfilment, we would not expect a case of plunging, immersing, in this promised baptism of the Spirit. By whom was it performed?

Im. By the Father. John xiv. 16, 17. He was to send the Spirit.

S. When was it performed?

Im. On the day of Pentecost: Acts ii. 3, and 11, 16. But we are talking about water baptism.

S. No; we are attempting to ascertain the scripture usage of the term *Baptize*. You say that it is used invariably with reference to one act, which is immersion, plunging; and therefore you believe that Jesus intended, by using this word, to make plunging the only mode of baptism. I say that the Saviour did not use the only word which, figuratively and literally, means nothing

else but plunging; and that he used baptize, which does not always refer to things plunged, immersed. And I am showing you that things are said to be baptized, which were not immersed. How did God perform the Baptism of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost? Acts ii. 3. There appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as fire, and sat upon them, and they were filled with the Holy Spirit.

Im. But it first filled the room.

S. No. Acts ii. 2. Suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and *it* filled the room. Peter says, Acts xi. 16, It fell upon them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the words of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit. This baptism was not by letting the body fall, as a heavy weight, into the water. The mode that God used was, according to the prophecy, "A pouring out." Jesus, John the Baptist, Peter, all call it baptize. You say there is but one usage of the term. Here is a thing baptized, but not by immersion. You must therefore give up your usage, or admit that the word has two meanings, in which case Jesus would not have selected it, if he could have employed one that had but one mean-

ing, if he intended immersion should be the way, and the only way. Here the proof is clear that persons were baptized by pouring out. This is Bible authority. And I had rather have it than all the men-made dictionaries in the world. Peter himself declared that this baptism was done by pouring out, according to the prophet Joel. Acts ii. 16, 17. John baptized with water. God baptized with the Holy Ghost. We have no reason to believe that they did it differently. But if they did, then there were two usages, one by John, and one by the Father. Which must we follow?

Im. The Father, of course.

S. His was by pouring. You know that there is but one Baptism. John said, John iii. 30, I must decrease, but (Jesus) must increase. John's baptism not only decreased, but ceased long ago. Acts xix. 5. Certain disciples who had been baptized unto John's baptism, had not even heard of Christian baptism in the name of the Trinity, and were rebaptized in the name of Jesus. John's has given place to Christian baptism. It is the one baptism: and includes that of the Holy Spirit. 1 Cor. xii. 13. By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body. It is in the name of the Three, the Father, the Son, and the Spirit. It embraces the mode of the Three; for they agree in one

The Spirit's mode is, pouring out. The Father's mode is the same. John iii. 29. The Son was to baptize with fire. As the mode of the Father and of the Spirit is clear, and you say that there is but one mode to one baptism, the Son could not require a different mode. We see that this mode is affusion, not immersion.

Im. Why are you so unwilling to come to water baptism?

S. There is but one baptism. And we are searching to find out whether God ever calls a thing baptized that is not done so by immersion. I intend to continue the investigation. And the next case shall be one of water baptism. 1 Cor. x. 24. The Apostle says that the Israelites were baptized unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea.

Im. Thanks to you for this case. It fairly proves immersion. The sea was on either hand, the cloud was stretched before, over and behind them, so that they were completely surrounded by water.

S. But they did not fall into it. They were not plunged into it. The account given, however, in Exodus xiv. is different from yours. The cloud was neither before nor over them. The Israelites became alarmed, and the evening or night before they entered into the sea, the cloud passed from

before them, and settled down behind them, between them and the Egyptians, and remained behind, not over and before them. So they were not surrounded by water, even if that were immersion. Would you call wetting a side at a time total immersion?

Im. By no means. The whole body must be sunk entirely under.

S. There were upwards of 620,000 Israelites, in this company. How did those in the middle get under the water? Remember, our object is to see whether God in the Bible calls anything baptized, that is not plunged in water.

Im. I do.

S. You say, That unless the whole body is sunk entirely under water, it is not baptism. How did the Israelites get under? Can you immerse a man on dry ground?

Im. No; the thing is impossible.

S. Then, in this baptism there was no immersion. For it is said expressly, Exodus xiv. 16, The children of Israel shall go on dry ground; 21, The sea was made dry land; 29, The children of Israel walked upon dry land in the midst of the sea. In several other places in the Old Testament and in the New, the same is affirmed. How do you get out of this difficulty? It is none with

the Presbyterians. They can baptize on dry ground ; and do it. They say it rained while the Israelites were in the sea.

Im. Stick to the Bible. Guess-work and assertion will not do. I see no account of rain in Exodus xiv.

S. I only give what the Bible states. Ps. lxxvii. 17. David, while speaking of this very event, says, The clouds poured out water. The only kind of rain that does not wet the ground is a sprinkle, and this too is the mode of clouds pouring out water. If then there is any water baptism here, it was by sprinkling. It certainly was in no case a baptism by plunging. You said, there was but one mode. It really seems so ; for whether God baptizes by the Holy Spirit, or with water, pouring, not plunging, is the mode.*

Im. I do not think that Old Testament cases have anything to do with Christian baptism.

S. Yet you thanked me for this case a little while ago. But it is the New Testament that calls this case of sprinkling on the dry ground, baptism. Paul was directed by the same Spirit, that directed Moses and David, to record the transaction he calls baptism. There is no plunging in it. There is pouring. So here are two cases in

* See note A at the end.

which persons are baptized, but not immersed, plunged.

Im. Why do you not come to plain New Testament times and usages? There you will find that nothing is called baptism unless it is total immersion.

S. I have been both to the New and the Old Testament. From both I have showed that the word baptized is applied to things not plunged, immersed, but to things affused, poured out upon, sprinkled. All Scripture is given by inspiration, and is profitable for doctrine and instruction. And as it has decided that the word is not always used in reference to things only plunged, you ought to give up the point.

Im. I confess that there is a greater appearance of truth on your side than I had supposed. I have heard so often that Presbyterians knew that they did not tell the truth, when they preached on baptism, and had seen so many quotations from learned Presbyterians, in which baptism was admitted to mean plunging, that really I was not prepared to expect this appeal to the Word and Testimony of God in your favor. But still the allusion to our being *buried* with Christ in baptism, is so pointed; the example of Christ is so powerful; and the case of the eunuch so plain; that I can-

not give up that immersion is not the only mode of baptism.

S. Even if these cases proved plunging to be one of the usages of the word, they do not prove that no other usage is made of this word. We have proved from the Bible that there are other usages, and that it is applied to things not plunged. You do not commune as Jesus and the eunuch did. By what right do you call for a facsimile in the one ordinance, and not in the other? You believe that the mode in which you commune constitutes celebrating the Eucharist to divine acceptance. But the disciples followed another mode. Yet they did the same thing that you do: obeyed their Lord as you, by communing. Thus you admit that there may be different modes of doing the same thing. Why is this not true and allowable in baptism? Though the mode be different, the thing may be the same. I am willing to continue to examine the Bible. And while I would not contend for modes, nor unchurch others and forbid them, because they followed not me, I am satisfied that the more we search the Scriptures, the stronger will be the proof, that the words *baptize*, and *baptism*, are used in reference to persons and things not plunged, but affused, sprinkled. Do you know of any prophecy, that

immersion under water should be a usage in Gospel times?

Im. No; I remember none.

S. But there certainly are prophecies of the use of water in the Redeemer's kingdom. You say correctly, that there are none in reference to its use by immersion. Indeed the word immersion, and nothing like it, ever occurs in the prophets, in reference to Gospel ordinances. But the words *sprinkle* and *pour* are frequently used in types and prophecies referring to the dispensation of grace. Direct prophecies are made of the use of water. Is. xlv. 3, I will pour out water upon him that is thirsty; lii. 15, So shall he (Jesus) *sprinkle* many nations; Ezek. xxxvi. 25, Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you. All these passages refer to Gospel times, and to what would be done in the church. That there should have been some allusion to so important an ordinance as that of baptism, was reasonable to expect. The only way in which water is used in Christian ordinances, is, in baptism. The prophecy of its use is by pouring, sprinkling, not by immersion. They lead us to expect that the usage which God had affixed to the term *baptism* would be continued, and that would still be called baptized, which was sprinkled with water, and that God called baptized.

Im. But the prophecies are to be taken figuratively, not literally.

S. How do you prove that? Does the Bible say so? If the prophecy had said, Then will I plunge you in clean water; would you have allowed me to say, it is figurative? But if it is taken figuratively, it puts immersion still farther out of the question. For figurative language is used, because it is stronger than the literal. Now immersion requires more water than sprinkling, and is the stronger term. Why was it not used?

Im. Let us go to facts.

S. I have been to them, and produced plain unanswerable facts that God calls persons and things *baptized* which were not plunged, but *sprinkled*. And that the only word that always means to plunge, is never used by the Saviour. You denied that a thing could be baptized unless it was immersed. Now even if other facts were to prove that things immersed are also baptized, it would, as I have before observed, only prove that you are wrong, and that either way is baptism, and the Saviour has not ordered which way we shall follow. I have no objection that you should prove that things immersed are said to be baptized, *if you can prove it*. I know that you cannot prove that nothing but immersion is called baptism.

Besides, the prophecies are as much facts, truths, as any other part of the Bible.

Im. The Apostle says, Rom. vi. 4, We are buried with him, by baptism. Col. ii. 12, Buried with him in baptism. I cannot see how any person can avoid the pointed allusion to immersion in these passages. We are buried in our baptism. There is nothing like a burial in sprinkling. But the whole figure of our being buried and rising again is solemnly set forth in immersion, in conformity to the death and resurrection of our Saviour.

S. How do you prove that there is any reference here to water baptism?

Im. I never heard it doubted.

S. I not only doubt it, but deny it. And will give you my reasons for so doing. The Apostle says, Rom. vi. 3 : Know ye not as so many of us as were baptized *into* Jesus were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death. Can a man be baptized by water *into* Jesus? Whatever kind of baptism the Apostle is speaking of in the 3d verse, he evidently continues to speak of in the 4th, &c. Will you baptize a man who is *out of* Jesus, if you know it? And if you did, would it make him "in Jesus?"

Im. I answer no, to both questions. A man must be converted, he must be *in Jesus*, a new creature, before I would baptize him.

S. So I thought. You admit, then, that water baptism does not and cannot baptize *into Jesus*. How are we made one with Christ?

Im. We are by one Spirit baptized into one body. 1 Cor. xii. 13.

S. True indeed. Now the Spirit's mode of baptizing is by pouring out, shedding, falling, descending, not immersing, plunging. If then we are baptized into Jesus, it must be by the Spirit and not by water, or if both, they agree in one, 1 John v. 8, and consequently it is not done by plunging; for we know the Spirit's mode, and the Scriptures call it *baptism*. But admitting that the Apostle is speaking of water baptism; he does not say that our baptism must resemble the *burial*, but the *death* of Christ. We are not buried with Christ in the likeness, or mode of baptism as a burial, but we are, by baptism, buried into the likeness of his death, not his burial. The Apostle uses the words planted and crucified, as well as buried, in the same likeness to his death. He shows plainly that he refers to his death, and not to sepulture: knowing that our old man is crucified with him, that our body of sin may be destroy-

ed. The death of Christ was the accursed death of the cross. There certainly is no resemblance between crucifixion and immersion. Yet if baptism is to represent the death of Christ, it should resemble crucifixion, not entering under the ground. But really, if baptism is intended to represent the mode of Christ's burial, it is more in favor of sprinkling than of plunging. Will you describe the usual mode of burying?

Im. A grave is dug, by displacing the earth. The body is deposited in it, and then covered up by pouring the earth back upon it.

S. Then we *pour* when we bury. So when the Presbyterians baptize, the body is presented, and the element poured upon it.

Im. But is not being entirely covered up, something like being immersed?

S. Yes, somewhat; but it is not done by the same mode. You say, that baptism means nothing but the plunging of the whole body through the water, as a heavy weight falls into it, and sinks entirely under it. Now this is not the way that Christ was buried. His body was not forced through the element of the sepulchre in which he was buried. Nor is it the usual mode of burying; of which mode you cannot speak or

think without reference to pouring the dirt back on the body.

Im. Why did the Apostle say then, We are buried with him in baptism, if baptism has no reference to a mode of interring?

S. The Apostle said we are buried, planted, crucified into the likeness of Christ's death, crucifixion, by baptism. Those who made a profession in his name, looked to his death for atonement, and to his resurrection for justification. Rom. iv. 25. If we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised for our justification. Their hopes were confirmed by his resurrection. 1 Cor. xv. : If Christ be not risen, your faith is vain—ye are yet in your sins. They professed also, 2 Cor. v. 14, to live unto him, who died for them, and rose again. See also Rom. xiv. 8, 9. The Jew, and in many cases the Gentile, who were baptized by the Holy Spirit into Jesus, not only felt and considered themselves as dead and buried to the world, but were often treated by their friends not only as dead, but as those who had died an accursed death. All the odium of the death of the Saviour was upon them. To the world they were crucified, and the world was crucified unto them. Our Saviour calls the hatred and

the persecutions of the world against his disciples, a baptism. Luke xii. 50. He confirms this by his remarks to the two sons of Zebedee, Mark x. 39-45.

Im. Were the sons of Zebedee baptized with his baptism according to his prediction?

S. They were. James was beheaded by Herod. John was much persecuted. And all who live godly shall suffer persecution. The odium of Christ's death, his cross, is upon them all. The Apostle says, Gal. vi. 14, God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of Christ (his death, not his burial) by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world. 1 Cor. xv. 31, I die daily. 2 Cor. iv. 10, Always bearing about in the body the dying (not the burying) of the Lord Jesus. Rom. vi. 3, 6, Know ye not that as many of us as were baptized unto Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death (not his burial) crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed? Gal. iii. 20, I am crucified with Christ. This language is true of every one that is made one with Christ by the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and of none others. And thus it is, that they are baptized into the likeness of his death. They take upon themselves all the sorrows, trials, persecutions and afflictions, as well as all the hopes

and glories of the death of Christ. They counted all things but loss for Jesus, for whom they suffered the loss of all things. That they might know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable to his death, (not his burial) Philip. iii. 10, etc. They filled up, in their sufferings, that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in their flesh, for his body's sake, the church. Col. i. 24. They also suffered for his sake. Phil. i. 29. How forcibly is all this set forth in the figure of our being buried into the likeness of Christ's sufferings, death! Bearing the cross, wearing the crown! This oneness with Christ, and union with him in life and death, is the result of the Spirit's baptism: not of water baptism.

Im. Do you not believe, however, that there is a reference to a particular kind of burial in the text under consideration?

S. No. The Bible is intended to be understood alike by all nations. All do not bury alike. Some burn, some embalm, some inter; some deposit in vaults; some elevate the body on trees; but not one of them represents the death of Christ. It was a death lifted up, on a mount, on a cross. A death for and unto sin. And our baptism is unto the likeness of his death.

Im. Your views would be more satisfactory, were it not for the fact, that Jesus himself was immersed. He was baptized in Jordan, and has commanded us to follow him.

S. Has Jesus commanded what part of the body, or how much of it, shall be baptized? Has he ordered how it shall be done? I will cheerfully obey the precise command, when you show it to me in the Bible. What is his command?

Im. Go, teach all nations, baptizing them, &c. Matt. xxviii. 19.

S. How then can you call me disobedient to his command? What words of it have I disobeyed? I have obeyed according to the mode *prophesied*, and practised by my heavenly Father, and the Holy Spirit, both with the Spirit and with water:—the mode that Paul and Peter called *Baptism*. I have studied the usage of the word, not in the words which man's wisdom teaches, but which the Holy Ghost teaches. 1 Cor. ii. 13. And I have obeyed as shown of God. Has Christ given a new-usage to the word? Has he commanded us to be immersed under water?

Im. I believe that he was thus immersed.

S. I have no doubt that you are sincere in that belief; and I as sincerely believe that he was not

But our belief is not authority. Does the Bible say that Jesus was plunged?

Im. It says, when he was baptized, he went up straightway out of the water.

S. Can we not correctly say, a thing came up out of the water, that has not been entirely under it? Was not this true of the Israelites in the sea; and also of them when they passed on dry ground through Jordan, and the Priests stood on dry ground in the midst of Jordan? Josh. iii. 17. How do you know that this was not the case here? Does the Bible say how deep he had been in?

Im. No; but I suppose——

S. Unless we can prove our suppositions, we had better not give them. The law of liberty will not permit us to condemn a brother for an act against which we can bring no "thus saith the Lord." Does the Bible say that Jesus went entirely under?

Im. I cannot see why he went in at all, if he did not go under.

S. Our not being able to tell why he did not go under, is no proof that he did so.

Im. I think that any common reader of the Bible would think so. I do.

S. What would you call a common reader of the Bible.

Im. One, who, unacquainted with the original language, takes our common English version, compares Scripture with Scripture; and thus, by diligent search is able and ready, from the Bible itself, to give an answer of the reason of the hope that is in him. 1 Peter iii. 15.

S. Would such a reader conclude from the prophecies, that Jesus was immersed? There is no such prophecy. Would he not expect that water would be used in the Redeemer's kingdom by pouring, sprinkling? There are prophecies of such use of it in the church. He would discover from the mode in which the Father baptizes, that Jesus was immersed—that mode is, pouring out. He would not find from the usage of the word, as it is written by Paul and Peter, and explained by Moses and David, that immersion was the mode. He could not tell from the words: "Go, baptize," what part of the body, (nor in what way) was to be baptized. You have owned that this cannot be shown. How then would he conclude that Jesus was immersed, and that nothing but plunging is baptism?

Im. Because he would read, that John bap-

tized in Jordan, and at Enon, because there was much water there. John iii. 23.

S. He would also read that he baptized at other places, in the wilderness, and at Bethabara, where there is no mention made of much water. It is reasonable to conclude that much water would be required both for drinking and for sprinkling, when we think of the immense multitudes that attended John's ministry. It does not follow that he immersed them, because there was water enough to do it.

Im. But he would read that John baptized in Jordan.

S. True; but the *depth* of his baptism is what the common reader would have to discover. All that is said about his baptism may be true, even if he baptized on dry ground; as God did the Israelites, and the Presbyterians did me.

Im. How can that be possible?

S. It was no unusual thing for those who addressed large audiences, to select the most favorable places for speaking, so that the people might the better hear, and the speaker be the less incommoded. Thus Luke v. 3: Jesus entered into Simon's vessel, and prayed him to thrust out a little from the land. And he sat down and taught the people out of the ship. Matt. xiii. 2. Great

multitudes were gathered together to hear Jesus. And he went into a ship, and sat, and spake to the people. The water near the shore was not deep. Luke v. 4: Launch out now (after he had finished his discourse) into the deep. This might have been, and probably was, the position of John. For it is incredible that John should stand all day in the water. The people might have waded up to the boat, there be sprinkled, and return out of the water. We can believe all this, without doing violence to the text, custom, prophecies, and usages of the Bible; and no man can prove that it is not so. Does the Bible give any reason why Jesus should be plunged rather than sprinkled?

Im. I cannot show any particular reason.

S. A common reader would not think that to be in the Bible for which he could show no particular reason. I believe that he would conclude that Jesus was sprinkled.

Im. That is strange! I would like to hear your reasons for it.

S. They are taken from the Bible. Why was Jesus baptized?

Im. To set us an example.

S. He did not say so: but, thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Matt. iii. 13. What does that mean?

Im. To do whatever the law required.

S. What law required Jesus to be baptized? Not the moral law; for it says not a word about it. Not John's law; for John forbade him, (Matt. iii. 14,) which he would not have done, if his baptism unto repentance and remission of the sins of individuals, each one for himself alone, (and Jesus had no sin,) had required it. The term *law* is used in the Bible in reference to the moral and the Levitical law. Jesus was about to commence the great work of atonement. This he was to do in the character of a Priest, Heb. v. The law required that every priest should be washed, purified with water. Jesus must fulfil this law. None was so proper to wash, purify him, as John, his forerunner—a Prophet—the greatest of those born of woman, of the tribe of Levi, himself a priest, according to the law. In Exod. xxix. 4, we have a general direction about ceremonial, or Levitical washing; Thou shalt wash their bodies. But it is not said what part of the body is to be washed, nor how it is to be done. Exod. xxx. 19, 20. A laver is provided for this washing, and in it the *hands* and the *feet* were to be washed. But still there is no specific mode appointed as to the manner of washing. In Numbers viii. 7, there is a specific mode of ceremonial, or Levitical wash-

ing, purifying. Thou shalt *sprinkle* water of purification upon them. As no other mode is divinely appointed, sprinkling is the only mode ascertained beyond controversy; and as no other law required Jesus to be baptized, and he was fulfilling it, he certainly was sprinkled, and not plunged. Jesus has commanded me to search the Scriptures, (not heathen authors and dictionaries,) for they testify of him, John v. 39. I have done so. And the only testimony that they give, is, that he was *sprinkled*. If I am wrong, it is because the Scriptures give me no other answer of the reason of the hope that is in me. With that I am satisfied. The only prescribed mode of the law for ceremonial washing, is sprinkling. Jesus fulfilled the law; and thus the law and prophets, and God's mode of baptizing, both with water and with the Spirit, all agree; it is sprinkling, pouring out—never plunging, immersing.

Im. Really you have made it out better than I expected. But if the Apostles baptized as Jesus was baptized, he certainly was immersed. Philip immersed the eunuch; and if so, Jesus was also immersed.

S. Does the Bible say that Philip immersed the eunuch?

Im. No; but it says, Acts viii. 38, 39, And

they went down into the water and baptized ; and when they were come up out of the water, &c.

S. You agree that Philip did not go under, yet he went down in, and came up out of the water. The same may be true about the eunuch. Does the Bible say how deep they went in ?

Im. No.

S. Is it right for us positively to assert that Jesus and the eunuch went under the water, merely because they went into it ? We know that it is not true of Philip who did the same thing ; went in and came out, but did not go under. You could not convict a man for plunging (catadunating) your child, on the testimony that he was seen to take it into the water, and come out of the water, and that the child had been washed while in it. Conclusive evidence might show that he did not sink the child, but washed him by using water in the usual way. This is all the evidence you have in favor of Philip's sinking, plunging the eunuch. I have evidence from the Bible that he sprinkled him.

Im. If you can prove that, I must give up that sprinkling is valid.

S. When Philip joined himself to the eunuch, he was reading Is. liii. 7. Philip asked him if he understood what he was reading ? He told him that he did not ; and inquired, of whom the

prophet was speaking. If I were reading a letter in which the words, *He, Him, His*, were frequently used, and, when you inquired of me who was meant, I handed you the letter to find out for yourself, what would you do?

Im. I would begin at the beginning of the letter.

S. This is the very thing that Philip did, Acts viii. 35. Then Philip opened his mouth, and *be-gan* at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus. From the eunuch's remark about baptism, it is evident that Philip had made some allusion to that subject. If there be anything in that scripture which leads to the subject of baptism, we can find it, by beginning at it, as Philip did. The prophecy begins at Is. lii. 13, Behold my servant shall deal prudently, &c. In the 15th verse it reads, So shall he sprinkle many nations. Now would Philip have attempted to immerse him, after they both had read that sprinkling was the way in which Jesus would use water, or baptize? This prophecy is not fulfilled, if sprinkling is not a mode of baptism. All things written in the Scriptures concerning Jesus will be fulfilled. But if there is to be no sprinkling in his church, this will not be fulfilled. Be this as it may; I have given you a reason from the Bible why I believe that Jesus and the eunuch were baptized

by sprinkling. You can give no reason from the Bible to the contrary.

Im. It is evident that baptism is a washing of the body. Acts xxii. 16, Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins. Heb. x. 22, Having our bodies washed with pure water. I do not see how sprinkling can make anything clean.

S. A washing in a shower-bath will cleanse. But I have proved from the case of the Priests and Levites, Exod. xxix. and Numbers viii. that *sprinkling* the body is cleansing it. The Apostle Paul points out this way of cleansing. Heb. ix. 13, For if the blood and ashes in sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh. Heb. x. 22, Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, &c. Here sprinkling purifies by cleansing flesh and heart; and we know that even houses are cleansed by sprinkling, Leviticus xiv. 51, 52, and is the washing required. For baptism does not save us, by the putting away of the filth of the body, but the answer of a good, a sprinkled conscience towards God. Sprinkling does purify the flesh. We are saved by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he *shed* upon us abundantly. Titus iii. 6. Indeed it is in vain to search the Scrip-

tures about baptism, unless we are willing to see the word **SPRINKLE** in connection with it.

Im. But still the original word—

S. Is the very word we have been examining, and is more in favor of sprinkling than of plunging, according to its Bible usage. Let us examine a few other places, in which the original has been translated, instead of being retained, as it is in the places already reviewed.

Im. I see now, that we really have been translating the original word for ourselves; in other words, we have been using the Bible as a dictionary of itself. I thank you for thus showing me how I ought to study it, and am glad that you propose to examine other places in the same way.

S. Paul says, Heb. ix. 10, there were *divers baptisms* (translated, in our Bible *divers washings*) in the first covenant, or Levitical law. Will you point out some of the *divers baptisms*, required to be performed by sinking, plunging, immersing under water?

Im. I know of no definite law, making such requisitions. A general washing is sometimes ordered. But when any specific mode is prescribed, I admit it is frequently *sprinkling*.

S. Yes; Paul himself in Heb. ix. describes their very *baptisms* (washings) as being performed

by sprinkling. Verse 13: The blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean sanctifieth to the purifying (washing) of the flesh. Verses 19, 21: Moses took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people. Moreover he sprinkled likewise with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry. The Apostle, continuing his argument to show the superiority of Christ's dispensation, introduces, Heb. x. 16, the very covenant that God made, Ezekiel xxxvi. 25, in which water was to be used by sprinkling in the church of Christ. Here then, Paul by inspiration proves that a thing is baptized by sprinkling, and that is called baptism, which is done by sprinkling and not by plunging (catadunating).

Im. I cannot deny the truth of this. For it is in the New Testament.

S. In Mark vii. 4-8, it is said in the original, that the Pharisees hold to the *baptism* of cups and pots, and brazen vessels, and of tables. In our translation *baptism* is *washing*, the *washing* of cups, &c. Now see where the (washing) *baptism* of these things are required in the law. Leviticus vi. 28, brazen vessels were to be scoured, and rinsed in water. Lev. xv. 12, Every vessel

of wood shall be rinsed in water. "Vessels are rinsed by dashing water upon them, or by a slight rubbing." (Webster.) Here then we have two more baptisms, not made by plunging, catadunating, but by dashing, rubbing, pouring of water. Moreover, the Pharisees held also to the washing of hands, Mark vii. 2-4. In the original, it is *baptism, baptizing of hands*. How did the law require this to be done? Lev. xv. 11, rinsed his hands in water. The usual way of this washing the hands, or as it is in the original, *with the fist, (shut hand,) up to the elbow*, was, to take the handful of water, then to close it, and elevating it, let the water run down to the elbow. Sometimes it was done by simply having water poured on the hands, as 2 Kings iii. 11, This is that Elisha who poured water on the hands of Elijah, and Deut. xxi. 6, All the elders shall wash their hands over the heifer, &c. Here then is another case, the baptism (washing) of hands done, not by immersion, but by pouring, sprinkling.

Im. The word translated *dip* in Matt. xxvi. 23, and John xiii. 26, is baptism in the original. There it certainly means immersion.

S. There it certainly does not mean immersion, but rather what we would call daubing, or *smearing*, which is done by pressing against a solid sub-

stance, not plunging into it. Jesus said, He that dippeth (baptizes) with me in the dish. After I have dipped (baptized) the sop or morsel. Now into what dish did he dip the sop?

Im. I suppose that it was a dish of gravy made from the Paschal lamb.

S. This shows the danger of suffering any other interpretation of God's word than the word itself. The lamb had no gravy. It was roasted in the fire, and without being sodden at all with water, Exodus xii. 9. And it was to be eaten with bitter herbs, which were not liquid, but solid, Exodus xii. 9; Numbers ix. 11. The lamb, and unleavened bread, and bitter herbs, were the only dishes used at the Passover. The bread was smeared (as is to this day) upon the herbs, so as to give it a bitter taste. The word *baptize* is often thus used, and is so used here, and is not a case of baptism by immersion. So we have another case in which things are said to be baptized which are not plunged.

Im. Here is another place in which baptize is translated dip. Luke xvi. 24, That he may dip (baptize) the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue. Here I see that it was the smallest portion of water that could be procured by merely

touching it with the finger, and is not a case of plunging.

S. It is even so. And here is another place. 2 Kings v. 10. The prophet tells the Syrian to wash in Jordan. He went, (verse 14,) and dipped himself seven times in Jordan (*baptized himself seven times*, in the original.) The prophet was a Jew, and gave the direction for the leprosy, no doubt, according to the law. The Syrian baptized himself seven times according to the saying, (command) of the man of God, (one speaking in God's name.) How did God command his servants to do this *washing, baptizing*? Lev. xiv. 7: He shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed (of the leprosy) seven times. This sprinkling is one of the divers baptisms spoken of, Heb. ix. 10. So if the man of God directed the washing according to the word of God, we have another case in which one is baptized seven times by sprinkling or washing according to the law.

Im. In the case of Nebuchadnezzar, Dan. iv. 33, where it is said he was *wet* with the dews of heaven, the original is, *was baptized with the dew*. I cannot deny that the dew wets by descending, falling upon persons or things; and it matters not how great the quantity falling, its mode is that of sprinkling, not plunging. So I must give up, that

according to the original, here is another person said to be baptized, but not by immersion.

S. I thank you for the frankness with which you enter into this investigation. Christians would love one another better, if, instead of appealing to human authority, and philosophy, and worldly wisdom, they would sit down in truth and sincerity, and let the word of God be the settler of strife and controversy. Let us examine just one more place, not because we have not had sufficient proof, but for the sake of instruction. In Rev. xix. 13, we read: And *he* was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood. In the original it is "*baptized in blood.*" Now how does *he* say this was done? How was his vesture baptized in blood? Let him speak, for it is Jesus, it is the Logos, the Word that was made flesh, and yet was God. It is the one Lord of the one baptism. He says, Is. lxiii. 2-3, in answer to the question, Wherefore art thou red (baptized) in thine apparel? I have trodden the wine-press alone;—and their blood *shall be sprinkled* upon my garments, and I will stain (baptize) all my raiment. Here Jesus, who commanded baptism, unites with John, and Paul, and Peter, and Moses, and David, with the law, and with the prophets, with the usage and mode of the Fathers and the Holy Spirit, and tells that that

is baptized which is sprinkled. Shall I obey Jesus, and believe him, that baptism is performed by sprinkling; or shall I say, there is no baptism without immersion, and baptism is immersion, and immersion and nothing else is baptism? Surely he who will not admit that Jesus is better authority for the meaning of the word than all human dictionaries, ought not to boast of following him.

Im. I am astonished that I have never taken this view of the subject before. I see clearly, that in all the *divers baptisms* of the first covenant, plunging, dipping, is never used, unless preparatory to *sprinkling*, which constitutes the cleansing. That sprinkling was the prescribed form. That the word baptize is often used in the Bible in reference to persons and things sprinkled, and in which plunging is out of the question. I must rely more hereafter upon searching the Bible than I have ever done.

S. While I set a proper value upon human learning and attainments, I always prefer that God's word should be its own interpreter. In matters of faith, I desire no one to believe me unless I can give him reasons from the Bible. I will believe no one unless he can do the same. We have now searched the Bible. We find that the

word baptize is used in reference to pouring and sprinkling, and things thus operated upon are said to be baptized. That there is but one baptism, *the Christian baptism*, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. That these three agree in one—that what is done in the name of the Three, must be, and is, in the mode of the Three. 1 John v. 8: There are three that bear witness on earth: the Spirit, the water, and the blood, and these agree in one. The Spirit is poured out upon those baptized by it. The blood and water are sprinkled upon those who are baptized by them. The prophecy is, I will sprinkle water upon him. The blood is sprinkled. 1 Peter i. 2: Through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. Heb. xii. 26: The blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than the blood of Abel. Truly they agree in one mode, as well as in one object. In every case in which we search the Scriptures for its usage of the word baptize, it brings us to sprinkling and pouring as the mode. You give me no prophecy, no thus saith the Lord, nor thus doeth the Lord, no answer from the Bible, why I should believe that nothing but plunging is baptism.

Im. Brother, forgive me. I have had hard

thoughts of your sincerity. I have spoken lightly about your baby sprinkling, and have treated you cruelly in acting towards you as an alien from the commonwealth of Israel. Hereafter I will try to do the will of God on earth as it is done in heaven. And I will own that Presbyterians believe and obey, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, like ourselves. That their ordinances are valid, and owned and accepted of God, and ought not to be rejected of men. I may be persecuted and cast out as evil for so doing. But it is better to obey God than man. And in following the truth that embraces the charity of the Gospel, I know that I am following Christ.

NOTE A.

S. I do not believe, however, that any baptism, by any mode, took place here. The word refers to the fact, that the children of Israel here became entirely separated and freed from their former state of bondage, and entered into a new relation and condition under Moses. Dedicated, consecrated unto Moses, or the new condition, is the idea. And is the same referred to by the Apostle, Romans vi. 3, 4, in which believers are represented as being dedicated, consecrated, by passing from the old condition of bondage of sin, *into Jesus Christ*, a new condition of holiness, under Jesus. If the usage of the word *baptize* is not confined to the idea of plunging, but refers to consecration, dedication, change of condition, of appearance, &c. And your plea of its having only one meaning must be erroneous.

This Book is defective.
As far as to the bottom of
the 12th page this which should
be Bible Baptist N^o II is
the same as N^o I. This is
the binder's mistake. N^o II
commences here at page 13
the first 12 pages being
gone.

THE
BIBLE BAPTIST,

No. I.;

OR,

WHAT DOES THE BIBLE SAY ON THE
MODE OF BAPTISM?

BY

THOMAS P. HUNT,

Author of the Bible Baptist, No. II. ; or, Who does the
Bible say must be Baptized ?

He, (the Word of God) was clothed in a vesture, dipped, (baptized)
in blood.—Rev. xix. 13.

Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel?—Is. lxiii. 2.

Their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments.—Is. lxiii. 4.

~~~~~  
**Revised and Enlarged.**  
~~~~~

NEW-YORK:
M. W. DODD
59 CHAMBERS STREET.
1857.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1846, by
M. W. DODD,
In the Clerk's Office for the Southern District of New York.

THOMAS B. SMITH, STEREOTYPER,
216 WILLIAM STREET, N. Y.

P R E F A C E .

THE author of this little work, first published it at the request of the Synod of North Carolina. It has found great favor among those who desire to be wise according to what is written in the Scriptures. It has also been a favorite theme for review and attack by others. The author has received reviews of it from the North, East, South and West. The old editions, numerous as they have been, are all exhausted, and the loud and numerous calls for a fresh supply, occasion this new edition. It is given to the public with the sincere desire that all who read it may be baptized into the Lord Jesus, by that Holy Spirit by which we are baptized into one body.

BIBLE BAPTIST.

Sprinkler. I understand that the communion of the Lord's Supper is to be administered in your church, and that you have invited the members of sister churches to unite with you, on that occasion. I wish to enjoy that privilege.

Immerser. To what church do you belong?

S. As Christ only died for me, I would, in remembering him, forget all other names; and rejoice with all who love him, to show forth his death. But you may call that "branch of the true Vine" on which I bring forth my fruit, the thorough-going BIBLE BAPTIST church.

Im. Then you believe in Baptism?

S. I believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. And I regard baptism as of divine command, binding on all who are fit subjects of the kingdom of heaven.

Im. You have then obeyed it?

S. Yes; on a profession of faith, after I was thirty years old.

Im. Brother, I am glad to meet with you, and do most cordially invite you to the table of *your* Lord. For we immersers are opposed to "close communion." But will you permit me to see your letters?

S. Certainly. Here is my certificate.

Im. (*After reading.*) I am sorry that I cannot recognize you as belonging to the Church of Christ.

S. Is not my certificate a good one? Is not the Presbyterian church, a church of Christ?

Im. Presbyterians do not hold with believers' baptism.

S. Indeed they do. They believe, that the promise is to believers and to their seed, and that none but believers can claim the privileges and use of this seal of the covenant. They require that believers and their household should be baptized, according to the practice of the Apostles in obedience to the command of Jesus. As Lydia and her household, Acts xvi. 15. The jailer and all his, Acts xvi. 33. The household of Stephanos, 1 Cor. i. 16. You do not require half as much baptism as we do. Therefore I said you might call mine the *thorough-going* BIBLE BAPTIST CHURCH.

Im. You know that there is but one door into the sheepfold. And he that enters not in at the door,

but climbeth up some other way, is a thief and a robber. Baptism is the door into the church.

S. Christ is the door. And he who enters in by him shall be saved, and none other. Do you not believe that some presbyterians have thus entered and will be saved?

Im. Certainly.

S. Then they cannot be thieves and robbers; for none such can enter heaven. They must have entered in by the right way; which is not by a mode of baptism, but by repentance for sin, faith in the Lord Jesus, and newness of life.

Im. I sincerely believe that there is but one *baptism*. Presbyterians do not believe this. Therefore I am compelled to reject them.

S. Indeed Presbyterians do hold, that there is but one baptism. They never rebaptize.

Im. I believe that the mode is essential to baptism, or that the mode and baptism is the same thing. And can prove that there is but one mode, Eph. iv. 5, one Faith, one Lord, one Baptism.

S. The Bible does not say, one mode of baptism, but, one baptism. I believe in but *one* baptism; the Christian baptism with water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. What more would you require of me?

Im. If there is but one baptism, I suppose that there can be but one mode.

S. It is not worth while to talk about suppositions. If the Bible is silent about it, have we the right to say that a man is disobedient who believes in baptism, because he cannot agree with us about that which neither he nor we can find in the Bible ?

Im. Our church has determined that there is but one mode, and that none shall commune with us, nor we with them, unless they believe as we do on this subject. But we are not close communists, we throw the door wide open. You shut it against yourself. Believe as we do, and come in and welcome. Besides you treat others in the same way, and will not let them join your church unless they adopt your creed.

S. True, we do not receive into church *membership*, such as reject our doctrines. But we do admit to church *fellowship* all who believe in the Lord Jesus and follow him, although they may not desire to become members of our church. I am not seeking to become a member of your church, but only demanding access to the table of our Lord. If I am his, he is mine, and I have a right to his covenant gifts wherever I find them.

Im. I have often felt that it would be pleasant

and profitable to me, to commune with others. But as I am bound not to wound the feelings of my brethren, I have always refused to join in communion with other denominations.

S. Are not all our brethren for whom Christ died? Is there no danger of wounding the feelings of a large number of them, by unchurching them; denying the validity of their ministry and ordinances; refusing them Christian communion; and, in this respect, treating them as publicans and sinners, while you cannot show the least authority for it from the word of God? But you said, that you sometimes felt like communing with us. Who shut the door against you? Did we not open it wide, and invite you in, not as a member of our church, but as, what is far better, a member of Christ? Did you not shut it yourself, against yourself, as you do against us?

Im. Brother, you are too hard upon us. We do not deny that Presbyterians are ministers of Christ. We are happy to labor with them as such, and do it.

S. Yes; just in the same way that you would labor with any private Christian, but in no other. Do you acknowledge their right to administer the ordinances of Christ? Will you receive them at their hands? Do you not rebaptize those that

they have baptized? Will you administer the ordinance of the Eucharist to them? None but ministers have a right to administer these ordinances. Will you permit us, invite us, either to administer or to partake of them? Certainly not. And yet, denying us our rights, and forbidding when you can do it, even our wives and children to commune with us as ministers or Christians, you say, we are too hard in charging this upon you. What more could you do to deny the validity of our ministry, and our title to the covenant of Christ's salvation? Do you not believe that God blesses the ministry of Presbyterians, and trains up in that church many shining lights, with whom you hope to commune in heaven?

Im. Yes; but we must wait until we get to heaven, before we can distinguish between the ignorance and disobedience which God may forgive, and that which seems, to us, to be an open violation of his law.

S. We are taught to pray: Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. If God will commune with us in heaven, and does it now on earth, how can you refuse to do it now, while you know you will have to do it in heaven? Modes make no difference with God, neither on earth nor in heaven. Why should they with men? We must

not call nor treat that as common, or unclean, which God the Father has cleansed, Acts x. 5.

Im. I would like to change the subject. I am bound to contend for the faith. I can prove baptism must always be performed by immersion, and that nothing but immersion is baptism. And, that unless a person is immersed, he is not baptized.

S. How will you do it?

Im. First from the meaning of the word in the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Dutch, and other dictionaries.

S. I am not acquainted with all these languages. Can you tell me who made these dictionaries. Were they holy men, inspired by God, full of the Holy Spirit. Or were they heathens, ignorant of even the first principles of Revelation?

Im. Some of them may have been good men. None of them were inspired. And many of them were unacquainted with the truths of Revelation, and were infidels, heathens, and pagans.

S. I have heard good and learned men, on both sides, contend that the dictionaries were in their favor. God, however, has not commanded me to search the dictionaries, but the Scriptures, for a knowledge of his will. They were recorded by

holy men, God speaking unto them by the Holy Spirit. But how are dictionaries made?

Im. Learned men read and study a language. They find out what meaning those who use a language, give to its words. They then write down the word, and give the meaning of it as used by the natives, giving the most learned of their authors as authority.

S. You mean that a good dictionary-maker always refers to the works of a man for authority that he used a word with a certain meaning.

Im. Yes; that is what constitutes a valuable dictionary.

S. The men then who make a dictionary from the Bible must always be able to show that the inspired penmen used the word in a certain way, and can refer to different passages in their works and in proof of the definition?

Im. Most certainly.

S. It would not be a good dictionary which attempted to prove what meaning Paul attached to a word, by proving from the works of Homer, that Homer used the word with that meaning?

Im. Certainly not. He must prove from Paul's own words, Paul's meaning.

S. Well then, can you furnish me with a dictionary that gives me chapter and verse from the

the beginning. In the first instance he selected Abraham, then the Jewish nation, and kept them by covenant as his peculiar people, requiring them to affix the seal of the kingdom on all who were to be taught in that kingdom. That is, those upon whom the responsibility of teaching devolved, were required to enter into a sealed engagement, the seal being placed on the pupil, in reference to every individual committed to their authority, children, servants, and even strangers who desired to become subjects of God's kingdom, that they would teach them the ways of God; and God sealed his faithfulness to be their God while they continued thus to keep his covenant. How often, how urgently, the duty of teaching their sons, and their son's son's generations yet unborn, is pressed upon Gods, people under the old dispensation, need not here be repeated. The Scriptures are full of it. At the coming of Christ, the wall of partition between Jew and Gentile was broken down. (Ephes. 2: 14.) That is, no new church was established, but the Jews were no longer to be the alone people of God, and only members of his kingdom. Not one nation, but many, all, were to be sprinkled. (Is. 52: 15.) Christ sent out his disciples to do this, saying: Go teach all nations. Gather the

kingdoms of this world into the kingdom of God and of His Christ. The time to sprinkle many nations has come. Affix the seal of your faithfulness to teach, and mine to bless; baptize them; sprinkle them with clean water, (Ezek. 36: 25;) "teach them to observe whatever I have commanded you. Lo, I will be with you." They shall be unto me a people, and I will be their God. The apostles went forth, teaching everywhere the things pertaining to the kingdom, urging upon all to take upon themselves this seal. And the reason they gave for it (Acts 2: 39) is "For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all who are afar off, even as many as the Lord your God shall call." The promise is not withdrawn from you nor your seed, although you crucified the Lord; nor is it now confined to you; you are no longer the only people of God. The time for the sprinkling, the purifying of the nations, the lifting up of the standard to the people, is here: and all may enter into the kingdom, and labor in the service of God, and seal their engagement to be his, to learn of him, and teach his ways to others. And the great duty of teaching was the constant work of the disciples, as numerous passages in the Scriptures prove.

Pres. Yes. The object of the Church, the kingdom of God, is the same in every age and nation. The work of turning the people from darkness to light, of training up a people for God, has ever been the great work of those in God's kingdom of salvation. The difficulty of the work is as great now as it ever was. And so also is the responsibility. God calls to no duty without providing grace for its performance. He gave the fathers a sealed engagement to be with them. And in providing some better thing for us, (Heb. 11 : 40,) surely he has not withdrawn his covenant and his seal, but has established it forever.

Par. You have my thanks for this view of the subject. I see that baptism, being a seal of the new dispensation, is intended for the benefit of those who have to teach. I had been led astray, by supposing that it had no such bearing, and was intended only for the benefit of those who were to be baptized. As I could not see how infants were benefited by it, and had often heard infant baptism ridiculed and reviled by good men who certainly were sincere in their opposition to "baby sprinkling," as they called it, and could not readily answer the question, What good does it do? I now see that the sympathy and compassion

and mercy of God may, in the ordinance, be extended to the helpless, needy, responsible parent. I know that it is my duty to teach my children, to train them up in the nurture and admonition of Lord. In looking at their condition, sinful by nature, at enmity with God, in friendship with the world, the flesh, and the devil, the enemies of God and of their souls—at my own proneness to neglect my duty, as well as at my weakness and ignorance—the sense of the awful obligation resting upon me is overwhelming, and I feel that I need all that a covenant-making and a covenant-keeping God can do for me, to enable me to be found faithful, so that at the last I may appear before him clear of the blood of my children, and say with joy, Here, Lord, am I, and the children thou didst give me. If God do not help me, both I and my children are lost, so far as my efforts are concerned.

Pres. It is evident that in order to secure the blessings of the Gospel, and to preserve the knowledge of God among men, early, constant, and great attention must be given to children. The Christian Church must scout the infidel notion of neglecting the early religious training of children. Scoffers of God cunningly speak of leaving the infant mind unbiased, and of suffering

it to grow up in ignorance of God, and in neglect of his truth, until it is old enough to judge for itself, well knowing that the man is but the trained child, and that those not taught from their youth the oracles of God, and raised in his kingdom, will not be most likely to enter into it in after-life, or if they do, that they will not be thoroughly armed with the truth, and able to resist every wind of doctrine. God has ordered it otherwise. In his works, and in his providence, as well as in the principles of his kingdom, he has intimately woven together the destinies of parent and child, and calls aloud continually on the responsible party, the parent, by every joy and every woe, both for time and eternity, to be found faithful to his trust. That there may be no failure chargeable on him, he gives the parent an unbounded influence, which nothing but that parent's folly can destroy, over the unformed mind of his child. To this he adds an authority almost unlimited, nay, entirely unlimited in all matters touching subjects in which the parent and the child are alone concerned. To this he has added the complete obedience of the child in its simple relation as a child to a parent. In all classes where God has not constituted other powers to determine between the parent and the child, the child is

bound to submit to the parent, who is in such cases answerable, not to the child, but to God, for his decision. There is no man who can dictate to me what I shall do with my child. I am to select its amusements, its pursuits, its instruction. I can raise it up with a passion for vice, and a hatred for virtue. I can teach it to abhor and despise, or what is almost as fearful and awful, to neglect the great salvation, and all the interests of God's kingdom. I can take it and raise it among heathens abroad, or like a heathen at home, in entire ignorance of God. I can impress upon it a full belief in the dark cruelties of heathenism and idolatry. I can make it a bigot and a fanatic either in religion or in infidelity. Who can prevent it but God alone! In a word, God has so constituted the parental relation as to put it within my power to exercise untold evil-influences over my child. I do not need divine aid to neglect or mistake my duty, and to ruin my child. I am strong enough for this in my infirmity, and if left to myself, I will certainly do it. But I cannot make my child love God, and delight in his commandments. I cannot make it a new creature, nor do my duty, nor raise my child up in favor with God and man, unless God give me grace for grace. Has he

laid upon me those awful duties and heavy responsibilities, and refused to be my covenant God? Surely, if I am Abraham's child, I have the rights of my father, and God will not withdraw his covenant. He has not done it. I rely upon his promise to be with me. I long to engage him in covenant to aid me in teaching my child to observe whatsoever he has commanded, and gladly affix his seal to the transaction.

Par. But is it not your duty, as a minister, to baptize all you have to teach? .

Pres. Certainly. And I always delight to do it when lawfully required. In the beginning of God's Kingdom every parent, like Abraham, acted as a priest or minister for God, in his own family, and affixed the seal of the covenant himself on those for whose instruction he was responsible. Afterwards, for the better ordering of the Church, Ministers were especially appointed to act as stewards for God and for his people. Were there no appointed ministry to which is entrusted the application of the seal, each parent would be bound, as formerly, to apply it himself. But now, none but ministers can do it, and that only by the lawful consent and application of those interested and responsible. It is the duty of ministers to affix the seal in all cases in which

Where
is the
power.

they meet with those who honestly desire to enter into covenant with God to do their duty. They are not required to affix it on the application of the ungodly. Nay, they dare not do it in such a case. Ps. 50 : 16—"For what have the wicked to do, that thou shouldst take my covenant into thy mouth, saith the Lord?" They cannot apply the seal when the party is unwilling to learn of Christ, and does not intend to keep the covenant. Nor can it be done where the responsible party refuses assent.

Par. I see now that without the consent of parents, the commission of the Saviour cannot be fully executed. Families constitute nations. To baptize nations, then, it is necessary to baptize those belonging to families. God constitutes the parents the responsible head of families. You go and offer to instruct the children of a family. The parents assert their responsibility, and refuse their consent. They tell you that they have no confidence in you nor in your doctrine. They look upon both as highly dangerous to the best interests of their children, for whose religious instruction God has made them responsible. They will not hear you. You insist on the duty of baptizing their children. They tell you that that is their concern, none of yours, and will not consent that you should

do it. What can you do? You dare not deny the correctness of their position. You dare not usurp their authority, nor teach their children to disobey it. All that remains for you is, to let them meet the result of their decision at the judgment. Happy for the domestic arrangement, God's word checks the disposition to creep into men's houses and to interfere with their duties. In no case, either that of adults or of infants and children, and servants, can ministers baptize without obtaining the consent of the responsible person, that is, the one on whom God has placed the responsibility. Nor dare it then be done unless you have reason to believe that the person thus consenting and applying intends to keep God's covenant.

Pres. You are correct in this view. Many years ago a warm personal friend of mine applied to me to baptize his child. He was a lover of pleasure more than of God. I told him that I was glad to find that he was disposed to do his duty, and stood prepared to do mine whenever he was ready. He thanked me, and said that as soon as all things were in readiness, he would inform me. Some time afterwards he came to let me know that "the christening" frock and cap, the pig, the lamb, the fowls, the cake, the wines and

liquors, were all ready, and the day fixed and the company invited, and he hoped I would come and baptize his child. I told him that I was ready. "But come, let us talk a little about this matter. What would you think, if I, acting as clerk of the county, would affix the seal of the county to a covenant which I knew was made contrary to law? What would you say if I were to administer an oath to a man who would perjure himself, when I had it in my power to warn him of the sin and to prevent it, yet would not do it?" He replied that he would have a contemptuous opinion of me in either case. "Well, my friend," I continued, "what right have you to the Lord's seal? Do you love God and keep his commandments? Do you feel that that child's immortal interests are of deep concern to you? Are you anxious and determined to raise it for God, believing that he has, in a great measure, committed its eternal destinies to your keeping? Are you convinced that you need divine assistance in the discharge of your duty? Are you resolved to seek it, in faith and obedience? Do you believe in Jesus, and rely upon him to be with you and bless you in your efforts to lead your child to him? If so, I am ready." He seemed astonished, and, after a little

reflection, confessed that he was totally unfit for entering into a solemn covenant with God. He did not mean to be a hypocrite, and knew that he cared too little for religion himself to undertake to bind himself to teach others that which he felt so little interest in, and which, for the present, he did not profess to obey. He was not offended, but thanked me for saying him from a solemn mockery of God.

Par. You, as a minister of God, could not affix your Lord's seal to an engagement with one who did not intend to be faithful, and who had neither love nor faith in Christ, nor felt the need of his presence.

Pres. That you may more fully understand my views, I will give you the form I use when I affix the seal in parental baptism: "Do you, the parent or parents, acknowledge it to be your duty to teach this child to observe all things whatsoever Christ Jesus has commanded? Do you feel that you have neither strength nor wisdom of yourself to discharge this duty aright? Do you believe, with your heart, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God—that in him dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and that he can give you grace to enable you to do your duty, as well as to save you from sin? Are you now

These hands
are used
in two senses
here when
are liable
to lead
astray.
The seal
of the
Abrahamic
Cov. did
not belong
to the father
to him a
child to
+ so but
was only
taken by
which his
people
are
to seal
the covenant
by circum-
cising the
child, was not merely entering into the Cov
actually keeping it.

willing to enter into covenant with him to train this child up for him? Are you willing to seal it with the seal of the covenant?" On receiving the proper answers, I, ministering in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, one God, and the only true God, baptize the child; that is, I affix the seal of the covenant in the name and behalf of the parties, by which the parent engages to teach the child, and Jesus promises to be with him and to render the teaching effectual. In cases in which I have reasons to believe that the parent is deceived, and does not rely upon Christ as the end of the law for righteousness, I cannot apply the seal.

Par. Truly, baptism may be of great benefit to the Church and to parents, without its benefits being confined to the child. God, in providing, however, for the necessities of the parents, has insured, by the best means, the good of the offspring.

Pres. In endeavoring to carry into execution the command to teach all nations and to baptize them, my first step must be to gain the consent of those who are responsible, and then to require that they be qualified to enter into covenant. Adults, upon whom alone the responsibility rests, must repent and believe in Jesus, be-

Digitized by Google on 17.10.14.

fore they can contract covenant engagements. Thus the Apostles required the heads, the responsible ones, to repent and to believe, and to show their faith by obedience, before they were permitted to claim the promise for their children. (Acts 2 : 38, 39.)

Par. But as many adults were baptized who had no children, how does your principle hold good?

Pres. My principle is, that for the benefit of those who are responsible for the religious training of those who belong to the kingdom of God, Christ established the sealed ordinance of baptism, and that it cannot be applied, except to those for whose benefit it is established. It is not provided for the wicked. Therefore an adult must be converted before he can claim it. He is responsible for his own religious instruction. Upon himself rests all the responsibility. He is bound to become acquainted with the mysteries of redemption, to grow in grace and in the knowledge of God. No one is bound for him. Everything is in his own hands. No one can stand for him. His whole accountability is between himself and God. If he then feel his obligation to learn and to observe whatever Christ has commanded, and the need of his Saviour's

grace to enable him to do it, he must be willing to seal his engagements, and to see to it that he is found diligent in the use of the means necessary for his instruction, and which will enable him to claim the fulfilment of the Saviour's sealed promise to be with him. Whenever an adult is thus prepared and willing to enter into covenant, Christ's ministers must affix the seal of the covenant. It is done on the ground of his individual act and capacity. When this responsibility rests upon another, that other is bound to meet it, by having the seal affixed, as Christ directed it, upon the persons to be taught, for the benefit of the teacher. So the principle is the same. When I baptize an adult, I ask, "Do you feel your responsibility to ascertain your duty in the kingdom of God, and to do it? Do you feel your inability, and the desire as well as the necessity of divine aid to enable you to learn of Christ and to keep his commandments? Do you believe in Jesus Christ, and can you rely on him, with a living faith, for grace and strength to enable you to live to his glory? Are you willing to enter into covenant with Christ, and to seal it with his seal, that you will endeavor to redeem your responsibility, and be found diligently and faithfully learning and doing his will,

Neither
circum-
cision nor
baptism

seal of any such covenant - This is all
God had appointed no seal for such a
covenant. 1 Cor. 7:12-16. A. T. O. 30

as He shall give you grace?" On receiving the proper answer, as in the case of parental baptism, I, ministering in the stead of Christ and by his authority, say to the adult, "ARISE and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord Jesus." (Acts 22 : 16.) When he arises on his feet, I baptize him, that is, affix the seal of his faithfulness and of Christ's to the covenant engagement, on the party whose consent must be obtained, and on whom the duty of instruction devolved, thus securing, in both cases, the training up in the kingdom a seed to serve God.

Par. I do not see how infant salvation can be proved, unless infant baptism is right.

Pres. No; for if infants do not belong to the kingdom of God, they cannot be saved. And if they do, they have a right to the privileges and benefits of the ark of the covenant. None but Noah's family entered with him into the ark. He and his were in covenant with God. He was a just man, and perfect in his generations, and walked with God. (Gen. 6 : 9.) God made a covenant with him. He found grace in his eyes. Peter, in speaking of Noah and his family being saved in the Ark, (1 Peter, 3 : 21,) says: "The like figure whereunto even baptism

Then
do not
believe
baptism
highly
of infant
do not
certainly
given

visitors must - Then what need of
enter the gospel by baptism? If this
is the case, then the gospel is not
of any use.

doth also now save us." That is, the covenant confirmed by the death and resurrection of Christ saves all within the kingdom, as the covenant saved all in the ark. None but those in the kingdom and covenant can claim the blessing.

Par. I cannot see how it is possible to carry into execution the baptismal command, unless the persons to be taught are also baptized. For the one is as positively enjoined as the other. The work of baptism without teaching, and of teaching without baptism, would both be incomplete. And you have very correctly observed, that the promise given to encourage in a work, would be a singular one, if withheld until the work was done. Such inconsistency is not found in the Gospel. The promise is given while it is needed, and executed when useful, while the work is being done. And it is affixed on the persons to be instructed, that those accountable for the work may be reminded of their duty, and of the ground of their success at the same time. I would not be deprived of this covenant promise of my God, for all that the world calls good and great. I have been ungrateful; and, instead of blessing God for his condescending kindness and matchless wisdom in securing to me my Saviour's sealed promise to bless me and aid me in the in-

struction of my family, I have even hesitated as to its propriety! forgetting that the parent needs as much, if not more, aid and help as the child; and that if baptism does not do the child any good, its value is far above rubies to the parent; and that if the child does not understand it, nor value it when he does, the parent can understand it, and prize more than he does fine gold.

Pres. Persons who deny the validity of parental baptism, little think that their view weakens the evidence of the truth of the Bible. For the doctrine of infants being baptized facilitates the proof of the truth of the Scriptures.

Par. How so?

Pres. The chief arguments in favor of the inspiration of the Bible are drawn from prophecy and miracle. An infidel applies to those who deny parental or household baptism, for evidences that the Bible is the word of God. He is referred to the prophecies, and told that he will find them verified always at the time of their fulfilment, or when the prophets said they would be fulfilled. He takes the prophecy in the 49th of Isaiah, in which Zion, the Church, mourning over the loss of the Jews, who were to be cast out, is comforted with the promise of a more

abundant progeny from among the Gentiles in the Gospel dispensation. (Isaiah 49 : 22.) Thus saith the Lord God, Behold I will lift up my hands to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people. And they shall bring thy (the Church's) sons in their arms, and thy (the Church's) daughters on their shoulders, &c. He knows that it was customary when the Jews only belonged to Zion, for the sons only to be brought, and have the seal affixed to them. He inquires, Are the male and female infants now brought as the sons and daughters of Zion? He does not ask if the sons are brought; for that was what the prophets were accustomed to witness, and might have expected. But are the infant females also brought into the Church? He is answered, No; there is no such custom in the true believer's Church; that some, through the invention of man, or instigation of the Pope, or the Devil, have attempted to impose "baby-sprinkling" on the Church. But that the Great Fountain of the New Dispensation received none into it but those who were able to come themselves. The language of that prophecy was only figurative. Figurative of what? Do you send me to your prophecies for facts, and then tell me they are only figures to which nothing answers

in the Church? If this be the course, to figure away facts, your prophecies and miracles may all be figured away to mean anything or nothing. Is it likely that such an inquirer would be satisfied with such evidence?

Par. I think not.

Pres. He comes to those who adhere to the covenant sealed with baptism. He makes the same inquiries about this prophecy. He is told to wait until the next Sabbath, then come and see. He attends Church on that day. The minister states the fact that God's kingdom is a covenanted kingdom, and the covenant is made with the members of that kingdom for the benefit of all belonging to it. That those of whom God requires the religious training of the infant subjects of that kingdom, Zion's children, are bound to bring them into the Church, and affix on them God's seal and theirs; that under the Levitical dispensation only infant males were thus brought. But that in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female, no distinction, and now both male and female infants must be brought and receive the seal that God has ordained to be placed on those who, as children of the kingdom (the Church), are to be taught to understand and obey the commands of that kingdom. He calls

The
there is
a
of
women
besides
the
the
having
Christian
Two

upon those upon whom the responsibility of doing this rests, to come forward and enter into covenant and apply the seal. Parents arise and bring the infant sons and daughters of Zion in their arms and on their shoulders, and engage to raise them for God. The infidel is astonished. He asks, Has this always been the custom since the Gentiles took the place of the Jews in the Church? He is told that it hath been so even from the beginning. That for hundreds of years after the introduction of Christianity, it was the universal custom of the Churches, and not one word was ever heard against it, as being contrary to the Gospel during that time. And that although some have since rejected it, it is still the custom of an overwhelming portion of the branches in the true Vine, among the Gentiles. Would he not be convinced that this prophecy is not figured away? That all is plain and literally fulfilled?

*These
to the
Churches
Gospel*

Par. I am satisfied that there is much advantage to be derived from regarding the Bible in its simplicity, and making it as little figurative as its oriental language will admit, and where it can be done, to give a literal interpretation to its statements, both of facts and doctrines. I have received injury, and known others who have

suffered from the effort to figure away things that seemed to be plain, because they militated against some favorite theory. Thus, when some who contend that the word *to baptize*, means to immerse, that is, to put under the water, and means nothing else in the New Testament, are pointed to the place in Acts 2d, in which it is said expressly by Peter, to be done by pouring, they say that it is figurative; while there never was a plainer matter-of-fact occurrence in the world than this baptism of the Holy Ghost.

Pres. There can be no complete following of Christ, unless Infant, or as I think it is more properly called, Parental Baptism (for it is extended for the benefit of the parent), be followed.

Par. How so?

Pres. I am required to say to others, Be ye followers of me, as I am of Christ Jesus. Now, if I follow one who refuses the seal of God's covenant to the infant of his kingdom, and Jesus did not refuse it, am I following him, as he follows Jesus? Jesus himself was a minister of the circumcision, of a Church which recognized the principle of applying the seal of the covenant on infants, for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers, and that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy. (Ro-

Peter
says
nothing
of
pouring

mans 15 : 8, 9, 10.) And while establishing on earth that very Church in which the Gentiles should rejoice with his people, he rebuked in anger those who attempted to prevent infants being brought unto him. He took them in his arms, laid his hands upon them, and blessed them ; and he said, Suffer little children to come, as these come, that is, brought by their parents, unto me and forbid them not. And the reason he gives for it is, "They are of the kingdom of God." A kingdom which recognizes the principle of parental engagements, with a covenant seal, to call on God for help to raise their children thus planted in his house, that they may flourish in the courts of their God, and still bring forth fruit in their old age. (Ps. 92 : 13.) If Jesus did minister in a Church which affixed the seal of the kingdom to infants, and asserted their right to be brought to him for his blessing, on the ground that they still belonged to his kingdom, it is in vain for any one to pretend to follow him, yet refuse fellowship with those who, like him, minister to, and receive infants into the Church.

No reader of the New Testament can fail to observe, that Jesus intended in some way that infants should be publicly received in his name.

Whosoever receiveth this little child in my name, receiveth me; and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth him that sent me. That is, I and the Father are one. There is a perfect agreement in the Godhead as to the principles of our kingdom. He received infants into the Church; so do I; so must you. If ye desire to receive me, ye must be humble like a little child, and receive my doctrine, own your duty as an obedient servant, and do it without murmuring, or aspiring after what you esteem great things. Be not above attending to any work, however troublesome or small it may appear. (Luke 9 : 48; Matthew 18 : 1; Mark 9 : 37.) Now, do those who reject infant baptism, in any manner, mode, form or shape, pretend publicly to receive infants, in the name of Jesus? From the unyielding zeal they manifest in following, what they call, the example of Jesus in being immersed, even when their whole authority for it is drawn from supposition, and heathen authors, and not from the mode as it is invariably alluded to in the Bible, it was to be supposed, that in some way they would receive little infants in the name of Jesus, by taking such as were brought by their parents, unable to come themselves, into their arms, laying their hands upon them, declaring

them to be of the kingdom of God, and blessing them. But no such thing is to be found. "The infants would be ignorant of the whole transaction, and after they grew up, might show that it did them no good." Truly, men must humble themselves as little infants, to the level of their ignorance, if they wish to walk not in man's wisdom, but in that wisdom which is from above. Those who deny infant baptism, do not follow Christ in receiving infants. Those who receive them, receive and baptize them in the name of Jesus. And this is the only way in which any who pretend to understand the Bible, know that it can be done. Is it following Christ to follow those who thus refuse to receive little children in his name, and who ridicule and excommunicate those who do?

Par. I have often heard ministers say to children, Jesus invites you to come to him. But I am satisfied that in the instance recorded (Luke 18: 15,) that the true meaning is, suffer them to be brought. Luke says, "they were *infants*," (Mark 10: 14.) Jesus says: Suffer *the* little children, that is, those that were brought, to come. If so, they must be brought; there is no other way in which they can come. Yet they are unconscious and ignorant of the whole

him and probably infants old enough themselves -

what place be given to those who are without the
 sign of baptism in his name? It is of primary
 importance to his disciples baptizing infants and the
 ends

that is,
 those
 who

transaction, and in after life may despise the whole affair. But this only confirms the remark you made, that it may, nevertheless, be their right to be brought. Their ignorance and after abuse did not destroy their right then, nor does it now. I now wonder, how any could evade the force of this position. I know that it is not a very pleasant thought to some, that there is no bringing, in a visible outward form, of infants into their Church. And I knew a man who became much offended with a Methodist minister, for saying, that the only two places in which infants had no membership were hell and the Baptist Church.

Pres. We know that Christ was with his Church in the wilderness (Acts 7 : 38). We read (1 Corinthians 10 : 4), that all of the fathers, that is, the whole Jewish nation, was baptized at that time, children and all. To say that it was only for temporal blessings and kingdoms that this Church was established, will not do: for it is expressly said, that it had spiritual blessings (1 Corinthians 10 : 3, 4). "For they did all eat of the same spiritual meat; and did all drink of the same spiritual drink. (For they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ.)" Nor will it answer to say

that that baptism was not the baptism of the present dispensation. For it was the baptism of the Church under Jesus Christ, he being with it at the time. He then gave an illustration of what he means by "baptizing a nation." When he did it, infants and all were included. When he commands it to be done, so it should be done, *for we do not follow his principle, nor him, unless he forbids it.* He has not commanded a part to be left out: nor did he leave out a part.

When he commands it to be done, so it should be done, for we do not follow his principle, nor him, unless he forbids it. While Christ was going about doing good, and teaching by example as well as precept the principles of his kingdom, he proved that he did not intend to confine its benefits to adults, and that infants and children should be excluded from them, because they were incapable of exercising faith. "Feed my lambs," those who are sustained by food from the parent, is one of his commands. Often, often did he thus bless children, not those who were capable of coming, and who did come to him, but those whose only way of access was through the faith of the parents, even in cases in which the children were ignorant of the whole transaction. The case of a certain man's child who was a lunatic (Matth. 17 : 14. Luke 9 : 38)—of the nobleman whose son was sick (John 4 : 49), the second miracle that Jesus did

in Galilee—of a ruler whose daughter was even now dead (Matth. 9 : 18)—the woman of Canaan whose daughter was vexed with a devil (Matth. 15 : 22)—of James, whose daughter was nigh dead (Mark 5 : 23), are of this order. He not only thus proved his power to bless, but the way in which he does it in his kingdom, through the parent's faith, "O woman, great is thy faith; I have not found so great faith, no, not in Isreal; according to your faith so be it done unto you," &c., is the way in which he then and now blesses children, although they are unconscious and ignorant, and do not understand it. Am I following Christ when I follow those who deny this principle, and refuse to receive the children on the faith of the parents?

Par. I see the force of this. Jesus was a minister of a dispensation that recognized the duty of parents sealing their infants with God's seal, as an evidence of their obligation to raise them up in God's kingdom. He also baptized all belonging to that kingdom, infants and all, the whole nation. He has recognized the same principle under the new dispensation. Now, if there is no prohibition in the gospel against it, the want of a positive command would be no argument against the perpetuation of a feature so invariably exer-

Did he
regard
her child
the bible
all the
scripture

What
parent
has the
power
to judge!

cised, and so very important. We dare not refuse to yield to a just and lawful inference all the force of truth, as is sometimes done by those who are fierce against inferences when they make against their views, and very furious for them when inferences alone can be conjured up to answer their purpose. How is it possible to exclude infants from the privileges of a covenant kingdom, and from being a part of the nation to be baptized? Only by inferences, which at the same time would go a great deal farther than the objectors believe or desire. Let those who deny the validity of parental baptism show any positive command, that it was not the design of Christ in instituting the ordinance of baptism, among other things, to secure to the Church the religious instruction of the subjects of his kingdom, and to seal his truth and promise to be with them, and render their diligence and faithfulness effectual to the end to which they were addressed.

Par. I am confident that this can never be shown. I see a light, a beauty, in the baptismal command I never saw before. Surely, the commandment is holy, just and good!

Pres. In order to evade parental baptism we must be driven to the necessity of setting too light a value on the spirituality of the old dispensation,

undoubtedly that the baptism of the nation alone would be a thing; then his argument would prove

The great
is a fact
inhibition
to baptism
infants
not all

me
all

and thus dishonor God for keeping his kingdom in such a worldly fix so long, making it only a nation of the earth, and not of his Christ.

Par. I am aware that great efforts have been made to invalidate the authority of the very Scriptures our Saviour directed us to search, on this and some other subjects. And many contend that the Abrahamic and Sinaic covenants only related to temporal affairs, and establish no perpetual spiritual principle in the new dispensation.

Pres. This is the more surprising, because we are so frequently informed in the New Testament that the Church is built upon the Apostles and Prophets, Christ Jesus being the chief cornerstone—that the Church is one, and only one—one Lord, one faith, one baptism. Read Paul's Epistle to the Romans, especially the 10th chapter. Does he there teach that the Church contained only temporal blessings; that it was worn out, pulled down, removed and destroyed; and that a new Church, on new principles, was erected, the Jews being left out of it, and the Gentiles received in? By no means. The root remains. A branch (the Jews) is broken off from it; another branch (the Gentiles) is grafted into it. When the Jews return again

will it be into a new Church? Not at all. They will be engrafted into the same stock or root from which they have been broken off, and into which the Gentiles are inserted. Does this look like a different Church? Now Paul, in thus stating the matter, had learned of Christ. And what had Christ said?—"Other sheep I have which are not of this fold (the Jewish). Them I must also bring in." Where? Into the same fold with the Jews. "And there shall be (not a new fold) but one fold, and one shepherd," (John 10:16.) Read Galatians 3:8, 9—"And the Scripture (that is, the writers of the Old Testament), foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel (not temporal things) unto Abraham, saying; In thee shall all nations be blessed. So, then, they that are of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." Does this look like only temporal blessings, or like a new Gospel and Church? The Galatians had fallen into the error that, in order to enjoy all the blessings of the covenant, they must become Judaized. How does the Apostle attempt to correct this impression? By denying that there was any spirituality and gospel blessings in the Abrahamic covenant? No; but the very reverse. He showed that, if they were

read, yet a cū in this argument for the
 not in in some things - Community
 prescribed etc. In eternal form

Christians, they and Abraham stood on the same ground, and were partakers of the same gospel,—that they were his children, and should be blessed with him, without becoming Jews. That is, the same principles of salvation, of gospel blessings, were in both dispensations. They both were one in principle. He did not pretend to say that there was no gospel in the Abrahamic covenant. Had there not been any, his argument would have been based on that fact. But, on the contrary, he asserted that the gospel was preached unto Abraham—that he possessed its promises and was saved by its faith. But yet he possessed no advantage over you. Wherefore seek, in the shadows of his dispensation, and the figures and types in which he was taught, that very gospel which is now more clearly revealed to you? I repeat it, if there were nothing but temporal blessings in the Abrahamic covenant Paul would have told the Galatians so. And it would have been his best means of convincing them.

Hear the Apostle again: Heb. 4 : 2 He is warning the Church against unbelief, from the example of the Jews who perished. What is his argument? "For unto us was the gospel preached as well as unto them." They failed

*because of the Church is not that
 is a man in one sense. But they are
 they certainly did not contribute.*

through unbelief to attain its rest. Let us take care how we treat the same gospel, lest we meet the same end. But, to put the matter to rest, read the 11th chapter of Hebrews. The Apostle defines Christian faith, and then goes on with a long list of holy men of old who possessed this faith, and became distinguished by it. These all died in faith, not having received (the fulfilment of) the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them. They sought a heavenly country (not temporal blessing), wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God. Yet, God had determined that they without us should not be perfect. In the 9th chapter of Hebrews, also, the Apostle proves that the Jewish sanctuary service was but the shadowing forth of the gospel. Do these prove that there are two different Churches? The same faith, the same promises, the same atonement, the same covenant-making and keeping God, the same rest, the same holiness, the same principles, and yet, one only temporal, the other spiritual! It is utterly impossible! Nowhere in the Scriptures, either Old or New, is the doctrine taught that Christ had two Churches built on two foundations. It is true that the Church has been under different dispen-

sations, and its principles shining brighter and brighter. But it has been always the same: a covenant Church, bought and washed by the blood of the Son of God. He who is "the glory of his people Israel," is the same who is "a light to lighten the Gentiles" (Luke 2: 32), and is "the true light which lighteneth every man that cometh into the world." (John 1: 9.) All who have been saved have been saved in the covenant, and constitute the General Assembly of the Church of the first born, whose names are written in Heaven. Until the coming of Christ they were all received into the Church, of which Christ was both head and minister, in their infancy; their parents, at the express command of God, applying the seal of a Scriptural covenant to them, as an acknowledgment of their duty to raise them for God, and of God's truth to confirm the promise made unto the fathers. Christ himself was thus sealed, in his infancy, with circumcision. And this circumcision is the same as his baptism for his Church. (Col. 2: 11, 12.) Believers are "circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in baptism, &c. Here, evidently, circumcision and baptism are put for the

not by
This
Circum
Circum
made.
without
hands.
Is between
Even if you grant baptismal regeneration
the baptism & the regeneration are 1

same, and described as being appointed for the same representation, and possessing the same efficacy. Now circumcision was a seal of pa-
rental engagement, and so is baptism. And, for hundreds of years after the coming of Christ, no one doubted it; and, to this day, but comparatively few deny it. The great body of the Church militant still consider infants as belonging to the kingdom of God, and require their parents to enter into the sealed engagement of baptism, applied to the children, to raise them for God. And it is singular that no hint is given, no command is revealed, to discontinue this universal and prominent feature of parental engagement, if Christ did put an end to it.

Par. It certainly is. But I used to think that it was strange that no more is said about it in the New Testament.

Pres. The silence of the New Testament on this subject, is strong confirmation of the truth of the doctrine. For if this sealing was to be discontinued, how do you account for no mention being made that it must be done away? Why is it that no murmur is heard among a people wedded to the system, against the repeal? Besides, we have but few records of cases of baptism in the New Testament, and most of them

not so.
see Gen
7.10-11.

See the
reason
the great
commission

...

...

circumcision is the sign of a new creature
to be said the same

certainly, and all of them, according to the opposers of infant church membership and parental sealing, under such circumstances that we would not expect infants to be present at them, for the opposers of infant baptism insist that there were no infants in the household of Lydia, and of the Jailer, and of Stephanos. They would not expect them to be brought out on the day of Pentecost, when the people came running in alarm and surprise, as the news reached them of the wonderful baptism of the Holy Spirit. Yet they cannot prove that the principle of the covenant sealing was withheld in those days; for Peter commands those present to be baptized, that they might claim the promise for themselves and their offspring. The promise is unto you and to your seed; it still remains as firm as ever, and as it always was, only the Gentiles are admitted to the same blessings. Had he said, Repent and be baptized, for the time has come when the promise is confined only to adults for themselves individually, and God has withdrawn it from parents, so that he will not seal his promise to bless their labors for their children's eternal good—then we would know that the parental right had terminated. He said not so; but confirmed their hopes in a covenant God on this subject. The

1. e. descendants -

baptisms at Samaria by Philip, were under circumstances which render it improbable that children were present. We are certain that in the case of the Eunuch, of Paul, of Crispus, and of the twelve men who had only been baptized unto John's baptism, there were no children, and of course no mention made of them. The sum of all the cases, in which baptism is recorded, is this: one case in which we did not expect to find children, and yet their right to the promise is admitted, Acts 3 : 39 : five cases in which males without families were baptized : two cases in which all believed who heard ; of course no children : three cases in which the households or families are baptized, and mention made only of the faith of the heads, the responsible ones. Those opposed to infant baptism labor hard to prove that there were no children in these three families. And after claiming for their guessing all the force of positive testimony, they boast that there is no record of infant baptism in the New Testament, because there is no proof that there were any infants present ! Suppose it is admitted. Then if there were no infants present to be baptized, of course no record was to be expected of that which could not take place, in consequence of their absence. But if infants were to be ex-

cluded from the kingdom, why is no record made of the repeal? Jesus did not exclude them. He affirmed their right. The Apostles did not leave on record their disapproval of infant membership, after the severe rebuke they got from their Master for forbidding them to be brought to him. Jewish Christians gave the Apostles frequent opportunities of declaring their opposition to the principle, if they had any. The Jews strongly contended that proselytes to Christianity from among the Gentiles, should be circumcised; but the law for which they contended, required the offspring of the proselytes also to be circumcised and baptized. Is it probable that they would have been silent, if the apostles had ordered both or either modes of initiation to be discontinued? When circumcision was omitted, they were content with the baptism, but not with the omission of circumcision. They were much and justly attached to the duty of sealing their engagements to raise their children in the kingdom of God. They would not silently have submitted to its entire destruction, for we find them zealous even for a part of it. In the beginning, when adults were baptized, as all had to be, we find particular mention made of the baptism of the converts. When those who reject parental baptism, report

the conversion of a person, they also report his baptism. Those who hold with the scriptural mode of household baptism, do not speak of the baptism of the converts, unless they had not been baptized in infancy, in which case they do. It is remarkable that after sufficient time had elapsed for those who were baptized in infancy to become converted, and join the church, no mention is made of their baptism. The case of Titus is one instance of this. But the case of Timothy is still more pointed. If any infant was baptized, we would expect it in the case of Timothy. His mother and grandmother were very pious. (2 Tim. 1 : 5.) If parental baptism was not practised, why is no mention made of his baptism, according to the custom of those who deny it? According to our custom, it was not to be expected. He had been baptized in his infancy. Both Titus and Timothy were proselytes. We find the believing Jews fierce for the circumcision of Titus. But it was not done. He had not been circumcised when he was baptized. But they say nothing about his being baptized as was required of proselytes and their children. Why? Because they knew that he had been baptized in infancy. Timothy was circumcised by Paul, but not baptized at that time, because he had been

easy to build theories upon
isatians!

before; when, we do not certainly know. But this we do know, that if baptized in infancy, the whole record is just as ours would be in a similar case; and if not, the record is different from that of all the churches; for the custom is to mention the baptism of adults. When Paul returned to Jerusalem (Acts 21), and gave an account of his doings to the elders in the house of James, they were greatly rejoiced; and yet they found it to be expedient, for the sake of the believing Jews, to caution him to show that he did not despise the Jewish feelings, especially in regard to the circumcision of children. (v. 21.) Now how would those who ridicule and deny the sacred principle of infant membership, have acted? They would have refused all communion with those who valued it, and have raised their voice against the practice, if it had been so sinful and absurd as it is reported to be. What did the elders advise, and what did Paul prove? That the principle of parental sealing was orderly, and that Paul was innocent of the crime of denying it. If it had been wrong, no doubt it would here have met with a fair rebuke on an occasion so proper as this, for the Jews had heard that he forbid the "circumcision" of children, not their baptism. If the proselytes, and it is proba-

ble that Timothy was among the number of these very Gentile children, were required to be baptized as well as to be circumcised, why did they not complain that Paul had denied baptism as well as circumcision to the children? The fact is, that he only insisted against circumcision, and not against the baptism of the children. Paul was right in not requiring the bloody seal. For since Christ had poured out his blood, there was to be no more shedding of blood in the Church. But Paul would not, and did not reject the purifying seal. The children were baptized, but not circumcised. The Jews never complained that he had violated the baptismal service, because he had not done it; they would have murmured if he had. They considered all that belonged to the kingdom of God as holy; and that such must be presented and sealed as his, not by their own act in the first instance, but by the act of those to whom the Lord committed them. Those unclean could not be offered, and were not considered holy. The children of such as were in covenant were holy; the children of those out of covenant were, like their parents, considered as unholy and unclean; and as the sacrifices of the wicked are an abomination to the Lord, such parents could not approach in cove-

nant, either for themselves or their children, until they repented and became holy. Paul admits the soundness of this principle. (1 Cor. 7 : 14.) He is deciding on the course of believing and unbelieving husbands and wives. His decision is, that they remain together, if the unbeliever is content to remain. His argument for it is, that the union is rendered holy by the piety of one of the parties; holy, in reference to covenant, and not in reference to personal salvation. For it is absurd to suppose that Paul would teach otherwise. If the union was not of that character which would embrace both of the parties within the covenant, then their children would be unclean, and could not be offered to God. They were out of covenant, with their parents. But if the union did not exclude the parents from the covenant, then the children were not unclean, but holy, and as such belonged to the kingdom of God; and their parents must acknowledge this; and seal, on them, their obligation to raise them up in the kingdom of heaven, for God. This shows clearly that infant offering unto God was retained in the Church; for the Apostle's argument is unintelligible and unconvincing without it. Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing; but the keeping of the command-

ments of God. He who is uncircumcised may be in the covenant; but he who has no right to be baptized cannot be, because he does not belong to the kingdom of heaven.

Par. I see again that the argument for infant salvation must depend, as you before remarked, on their right to the covenant. If they do not belong to the kingdom they are unclean, and cannot be offered. If they do belong to the kingdom, then it is plainly a duty, that those to whom they are intrusted, shall acknowledge their Master's rights in them. He would be considered a strange shepherd who would refuse to put his master's mark, and to acknowledge his master's right to the lambs of the flock. It is just as important that the owner's right to the lambs should be admitted, and that they should be within the fold, as that the rest of the flock should be cared for. Infants belong to Christ, and his right should be owned, and they received into his kingdom as his property.

Pres. In one sense it is more important to receive the children into the kingdom, the Church, than adults. The well-being of society depends upon the right ordering of children. God, who is wonderful in wisdom, has not overlooked this principle. In the Abrahamic covenant, which

secures the blessings of the Gospel to all nations, and constitutes Abraham the father of the faithful, the very foundation of his one Church is composed of this imperishable, everlasting substance, that shall never pass away, viz.: That a covenant-making God requires parents to enter into covenant with him to train up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. If the principle became extinct, when did it expire? Not at the giving of the Law, for it was still retained under that dispensation. Not at the coming of Christ, for he did not repeal it; if he did, where? Not during the lives of the Apostles; for their practice of baptizing households, and Paul's argument on the case of the unbelieving husband, &c., and the conduct and jealousy of Christian Jews, and the records of the Church, all show that this principle was still as dear as it was familiar. The necessity for it is as great now as ever. Why are we called the children of Abraham, if we have no right to our father's covenant? If that covenant no longer exists, there can be no connection between us and Abraham.

Par. If the necessity of a thing be an argument in its favor, nothing is more clearly established than a covenant by which parents

secure the blessing of God, and God the faithfulness of parents in training up a seed to serve him. The plan of salvation is provided for the necessities of its subjects. And that which is necessary and lawful, God will not withhold. Even if there were no reasons drawn from the Bible, yet the necessity of the case would loudly plead in its favor. But do you suppose that none but baptized children are saved?

Pres. Far from it. Baptism saves no one. Infants, whether baptized or not, belong to the kingdom of God, during their infancy. If they die in that state, they and all other persons incapable of being outwardly called, as all other elect persons, "are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, where, and how he pleases." (Confession of Faith, 10, 3.) So clear is this truth that none dare deny it. But Presbyterians, and those of like faith, alone hold it in its full truth, and so publish what they hold to the world. Some deny that electing grace of God, in consequence of which all are saved; yet, in their prayers, plead, at the baptism of infants, that they may become among the elect children of God; thereby leaving the impression that none are elect unless they are baptized. And the great anxiety manifested by many

such to have their dying child baptized, and the uneasiness they feel if it be not done; the reluctance manifested to read the burial service, and the actually omitting a part of it over the unbaptized, as is done by some, too painfully prove that they have certain views on the subject of salvation in connection with baptism, which are far from being consoling to the bereaved, or in accordance with the Gospel. All are unwilling openly to avow the belief that any infants are lost. Yet their actions manifest a strange inconsistency, if they believe that all infants, dying in infancy, whether baptized or not, are among the elect of God. It is true that none dare deny that infants are of the kingdom of God. But some do hesitate to seal their engagements to raise up their children to God, on the ground, that many, baptized and pronounced "regenerated" in infancy, do afterwards become reprobates. If it was contended that baptism produced a saving change on the child, then the objection would be valid. Or if it was urged as the child's duty and act, it would be valid. But such is not true in either case. Baptism does not effect an inward change. It is the sign of it in adults, but not the cause of it in any. It is not the duty nor act of the infant. It is the duty

and act of the parent. This objection does not affect the subject at all. For whether the child be baptized or not, it is nevertheless the parent's duty to train up the child aright. And the children of those who do not baptize them, yet whose duty to train them is not more clear than the duty of parental baptism is to me, become reprobates. And baptized adults sometimes become reprobates. Nor can it be denied, that there is reason to fear that many persons are lost, who would have been saved had they died in infancy. My belief is, that all who die in the kingdom are saved; but I do not believe that all who are born in the kingdom die in it. We do not baptize infants as their act nor duty, nor to make them subjects of the Church. But we do it, because it is our duty to baptize all who belong to the kingdom, as infants certainly do. They are of the kingdom of God, and we are bound to treat them accordingly. Whenever it shall be demonstrated that they are not of the kingdom of heaven, we will cease to baptize them. As Christians and Christian ministers, we have no right to come down from our work, and concern ourselves about things which do not belong to the kingdom of our Lord. When it shall be proved that infants are not of that kingdom, we will give up

all hopes of such being saved, if they die before they repent and are baptized. "For without (the kingdom) are dogs and sorcerers," whose end is to be burned with unquenchable fire. In baptizing infants we act on the same principle that we do in baptizing adults.

Par. How?

Pres. When an adult applies for the seal of his covenant engagement to be the Lord's, we look for evidences that he belongs to the Lord. Without repentance and faith, and the desire and determination of obedience, no adult belongs to Christ. He must be born again, not in baptism, but of water (the truth) and the Spirit, before we will baptize him. When we are satisfied in the judgment of charity of his right to the privileges of the covenant, we receive him. All anti-pedobaptists refuse to baptize any who do not belong to the kingdom, and profess a willingness, and certainly are bound, to baptize all who do. The clearer the evidence that the applicant belongs to the kingdom of God, the more readily do we baptize him.

Par. I understand you now. But after all the evidence we can obtain in reference to an adult, we may be, and often are, deceived. Our only resource is the evidence of men, and the de-

clared experience of the individual. The Lord never knew many of them. But in the case of infants, we have the direct and unerring testimony of God through his Son. There can be no mistake about it. He said: Suffer the infants, the little children, to come (those who could only come by the act of their parents, who brought them), forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God. (Of such materials even of the infants of the covenant, in all ages, and under all dispensations of the Church, I build up my kingdom.) He took them into his arms. He laid his hands upon them. He blessed them. Clearly convinced of this, I do not see how any can forbid water that these should be baptized. Seeing that God has pronounced them clean, how can any treat them as they do the unclean, or call that common that God has cleansed (Acts 10: 15), or that unholy which he calls holy (1 Cor. 7: 14), or treat as strangers and aliens, as without the kingdom, those that God declares to be in it?

Pres. We baptize only when satisfied that the seal is applied to those in the kingdom. And dare not refuse it to such; when they are brought.

Par. Is not the Lord's Supper also a seal of

the kingdom? Why do you not receive infants into the communion?

Pres. For the same reason that we baptize them. The ordinance of the Supper is the seal of the individual obligation to show forth the death of Christ until he come. For this, each is alone responsible for himself. He cannot do it for another, nor can another do it for him. He must examine himself, and see that he is in the faith. He must do it with knowledge, as a personal duty, in which he himself is alone interested. So it is in the baptismal act. The individual applies it for himself. It is his duty to baptize the child, not the child's to have itself baptized. It is his duty to teach the child, not the child's to have itself taught. None but adults can have the seal applied, for none but they are responsible. The obligation of the first seal, is the individual obligation of instructing in the truth. That of the second, is, the exhibition, the showing forth of the efficacy of that instruction, by manifesting the faithfulness of Christ's promise, by which those arrived at age and capacity become living epistles, to be read of all men, showing forth the value of the Lord's death until he come again. The effect of the first must be produced, before the second can take

place. As soon as the baptized infant has faith, this effect is produced; and he is then bound to seal himself with the second seal, but not until then. For, although he die in infancy, baptized or not, he is saved. Yet if he live, and do not believe, he will perish. He that believeth, and is baptized (not gets baptized), shall be saved. (Mark 16: 16.) The time of baptism is not essential to baptism, nor is the faith of the subject to whom the seal of baptism is applied, requisite, but faith in the one whose duty it is to have it done. I believe, however, that even those who insist upon faith in those that they baptize, do not contend that it is absolutely necessary. For, in cases in which deception, either designedly or unintentionally, has occurred, and the individuals have apostatized, and all parties are clearly satisfied that they never had faith; yet if they afterwards manifest true repentance and faith, they are received into the Church without being re-baptized. "They believe" and "are baptized." And this I believe to be correct. But we do not, in the Eucharist, engage for others, we act for ourselves. In baptism we act not only for ourselves, but also for others, even for the kingdom of God, and the subjects thereof.

Par. I own that this is the true view. But

may parents neglect parental baptism and be innocent?

Pres. Certainly not. God has ordained and established the principle in his kingdom. He has implanted it deep in the parental heart—caused it to grow out of the parent's necessity, and provided it for that need. The success and glory of his word are intimately connected with it; and none can set themselves against it and be innocent. I would no more admit into covenant one who would neglect the command of baptism than I would one who would neglect the Lord's Supper. I do not mean to say that those who, under certain circumstances, do not comply with the ordinances of the gospel are not Christians, and cannot be saved. But those who refuse to enter into and keep the covenant, as God has ordained it, cannot be innocent in that respect, and, as a general rule, do not know the Lord, and are not known of him. Those who neglect covenant baptism, deprive themselves of great privileges, and incur awful responsibilities. How do they regard their children? As heathen, or subjects of the kingdom? What plea can they bring for a blessing on them? If they rely on religious instruction and prayer by faith, that faith must be founded on the covenanted promise of God.

It is the commission of Jesus to teach, and the faith that prompts to it must be derived from Christ's commands. But how can the order to teach be separated from the order to baptize? They are both in the commission. If they rely upon the promise, where else do they find it, but linked with the duty of baptizing and teaching, in the covenant? "Baptize them, teach them, I am with you." They cannot find a promise without the covenant, nor a covenant without the seal. God has no other kind of kingdom, but a covenanted kingdom with its seal, so far as his salvation is revealed for man. If acknowledging before God, in prayer, my obligation to teach my child, dare I affirm that I do not find that obligation in the baptismal commission, that Christ did not make it my duty there? When I plead with God to be with me and bless me in my teaching, dare any say I do not find his promise that he will, in the same commission? If, then, I find the duty, and the promise, and the seal, all there, how can I reject one without rejecting all? (James 2 : 10)—"Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." If God has united the seal, the duty, and the promise, men dare not separate that which God has joined together.

Par. If all parents felt, as they ought to do, their obligations to raise their children up for God—if in that fear of the Lord which is the beginning of wisdom, they looked upon their children as heirs of immortality, committed to their guardianship, and intrusted to them for God and his kingdom, they would prize more highly the provisions of his grace. But, unfortunately, many parents, like unbelieving Jews, seek only for temporal blessings for themselves and children. They are anxious, and laborious, and generous to have them instructed, accomplished, and distinguished in the wisdom, glory, wealth and honors of a world at enmity with God; but bestow but little anxiety, and less labor, to have them become the friends of God, and children of the Most High. Too few feel it to be a prominent, first duty to instruct them in those things which make for their eternal peace. Hence too few value the ordinance ordained of God; and many live as though they believed that but little instruction in heavenly things is sufficient for immortal destinies; and bestow that little with but faint impressions that its success depends upon a covenant-making and a covenant-keeping God. Too many of the few who feel at all on this subject, rely on the outward means of grace,

prostituted to a wrong purpose, and faithlessly performed. I admit that the sentiments, arguments and conduct of some of the friends of parental baptism, have done more to discredit it than all the reasonings of those who are opposed to it; and have been most fearfully calculated to bring the ordinance into disrepute. Unconverted men, refusing to keep the covenant of God, have been aided by some branches of the Church in throwing off the responsibility which God has placed upon them alone, and eased their conscience by accepting substitutes, as though personal duties and services for God can be substituted! and got others to agree to do that which, in the very nature of the case was impossible for them to do, and that which God did not require at their hands. In this substitution promises are made for the child, considered as its own act, and the child is pronounced as acting in a capacity which absurdity itself could scarcely conjure up, and the substitute enters into engagements not only to teach the child to think, to love, to hate, to obey, &c., but really to do these things, impossible, utterly impossible as they are, for the child. And by and by the child is called upon to come forward and relieve the substitute, and take upon himself, now he is capable of

doing it, that which the substitute, according to an engagement very solemn to him, engaged to do for him, and has been doing for him. Heretofore he has had no connection with the world, the flesh and the devil; nor the pomps and vanities of the world. His substitute renounced them all for him long ago. But he is getting unable to hold on—the child must relieve him! Deeply as I feel the solemnity of the subject, I cannot help feeling that the child is a fool if he complies. If the substitute really has, in his stead, done his thinking, loving, obeying, and keeping pure from the world, and bears the responsibility of the failure, as his surety, let him abide the consequences of it. But the egregious folly of such vain presumptions has made many turn away in disgust from the ordinance of God. Their mistake consists in regarding the views of men instead of the word of God. They turn from fallacious views and absurd arguments for the truth of a doctrine, from the doctrine itself.

Others have thrown the roll of the covenant wide open, and permitted men to enter into covenant, solemn engagements, and to seal with Heaven's high signature, vows and obligations to raise their children in the fear and way of the Lord, while neither charity nor reason restrained the belief that their only desire, so far from being

to acknowledge God at all, is, "depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways." Wicked, prayerless, corrupt parents, who know nothing of God in Christ, are permitted to enter into engagements they do not understand, and to make promises they do not mean to keep, and vows that they violate in the very utterance of them at the baptismal sealing! No wonder many turn away incredulous that such can be the institution of Heaven. These err by mistaking the prostitution of the ordinance for its true end. Others, again, throw around the visible means of grace, and ordinances of the gospel, a kind of converting, regenerating claim, and by their anxiety for the outward, sink the importance of the inward means of salvation, and claim for certain forms and modes, and signs and seals, that which neither reason nor the gospel justify, and thus make enemies of God's ordinance.

There are others, of a good moral character, and more sound reason, and serious purpose, who enter into the engagement, yet do not fulfil it; while, but too few of the few who really love the Lord, have corresponding views and actions requisite to put to silence those who look too often to see what God has commanded, from the effect it produces among frail, erring men, rather than

from the word and testimony of God himself. And, until Bible truth is more extensively taught and circulated than it is, I do not see how it can be otherwise. In the age of the French Revolution, Tom Paine could not find a Bible to copy from, when he wrote against it. No wonder that Voltaire, knowing and seeing nothing of Jesus and that which was called his gospel, but in the corrupt morals and absurd dogmas of the Church around him, became an infidel, and longed "to crush the wretch." It was not the truth, but its corruption, that made him an infidel. Thus the unfaithfulness of Christian parents, and looseness of ministers in receiving into the covenant, and unsatisfactory and absurd views of the gospel, have done more to injure the precious Heaven-born ordinance of parental sealing, gospel baptism, than anything ever said by its opposers. It was corrupt human views of this doctrine that caused it first to be opposed, and that have mainly kept up the opposition. For, very many who neglect the ordinance, deeply feel the propriety of some such act, by which they may publicly acknowledge their duty to God, and claim his promise in reference to their children. But when they ask, "what good does it do?"—and listen to the sentiments

and search into the conduct of those attempting to answer, they, failing to find their views in the gospel, or confirmed by the result, reject the ordinance, not on account of its impropriety, but because of the feebleness of its defence.

Pres. Infant or parental baptism, as you have correctly remarked, met its first opposition from its perversion, as we find in the controversies on that subject among the fathers, as many of the early writers are called. They did not at first deny the doctrine; in that all were agreed. But they did disagree about its nature, and efficacy, and end. This disagreement led to others, until the Bible was abandoned in the controversy, and metaphysics and human speculations did the work of the truth, and error became bold. Yet infant baptism remained in the Church. Most miserably perverted and abused as it was, God took care that it should not be destroyed. At the Reformation, the Reformers returned from human speculations and decisions of men, to the word of God, to find out what was the foundation of his Church. Infant baptism was retained as a doctrine found there. Being content with the doctrine, they sought to give it too much of the corruptions already imposed upon it, or to attach to it those absurd notions, too strong traits

of which still call for the unsatisfactory views from those who advocate them. This gave rise to its opposition after the Reformation, and still continues it in a great measure. Had not the Reformers fell into the error of baptismal regeneration, and water washing away of sins, and of appealing to the contradictory, bungling, irrelevant testimony of the fragments, and remnants, and interpolations, and corruptions, and forgeries of writings called the Fathers, to sustain them, it is highly probable that no one would ever have opposed the doctrine. As it was, it is almost a wonder that everybody did not oppose it; for Romish notions and human authority can never advance the truth of God among men who love that truth in its simplicity. Had I no other means of arriving at the truth than the authority too often relied upon for it, I fear I would become an infidel too. Dearly as I prize parental baptism, I should feel that I have greatly mistaken the Bible, if it teaches all the notions which many attach to infant baptism. But regarding it so far as it is a seal, as a seal of the New Covenant, securing my faithfulness to God, and God's faithfulness to me, in the great duty of teaching those for whom I am responsible, and in keeping alive and disseminating the truth of God, the subject is dear and pre-

cious, clear and comforting, and in perfect accordance with the desire of the Christian's heart, and the principles of the Bible, and dealings of God with his Church. In spite of all enemies, foes without, and foes within, God has taken care of the pillars of his Church, and will do it. No weapon formed against them can prosper. And among the brightest, and best, and firmest of those branches of the vine which bring forth more abundantly, are to be found those who cling to the covenant, and joyfully enter into it. Much the larger proportion of those who are Israelites indeed, and of the seed of Abraham, have had the benefit of parental baptism. It still continues, has been from the beginning, and will be until the end ; for the Saviour said, "Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you. Lo! I am with you alway; even to the end of the world." He certainly commanded us to receive little infants brought by their parents, as of the kingdom of heaven, and assured us that, whosoever receiveth one such little one in his name, receives him. He is faithful, and while we do it, and teach it, will be with us even unto the end.

THE END.

A BOOK FOR EVERY ONE.

THE WORLD'S LACONICS;

Or, The Best Thoughts of the Best Authors, Ancient and Modern, in Prose and Poetry, Alphabetically and Topically arranged. By EVERARD BERKELEY. With an Introduction, by WM. B. SPRAGUE, D. D. 1 vol. 12mo.

"So far as we know, this is decidedly the best book of the kind in the whole of English, and, we believe it may safely be added, of the world's literature."—*Hartford Daily Times*.

"This volume contains a mine of valuable sayings and sentiments from the great masters of language. A California of Golden Thoughts, on subjects alphabetically arranged."—*Christian Advocate*.

"This is by far the best book of laconics ever published. It is a perfect storehouse of thought and truth, sparkling, from beginning to end, with the richest gems, gathered from the pages of the best authors of ancient and modern times."—*New London Daily Star*.

"It contains a rich collection of great thoughts—thoughts which cannot die, for they have the principle of life in them."—*Christian Observer*.

"It is a glorious ocean of thought and sentiment, moral and spiritual."—*Spectator*.

"Here is a book, 'The World's Laconics,' that has not a single paragraph in it that would not suffice to leaven a pretty big lump of modern reading."—*Express Messenger*.

"The labor and research necessary to make up such a volume as this, must have been very great; but they are not greater than the good judgment and taste displayed in the manner of its execution."—*Cumming's Evening Bulletin*.

"It is a book where are enshrined the richest pearls, fished from the great ocean of thought."—*Christian Intelligencer*.

"Here, on every page, sparkle the purest gems of those who have lived to enlighten, instruct and benefit the world, by their imperishable writings."—*Daily State Register*.

"This work seems to be carefully and skilfully compiled, and gives us a great accumulation of the wisest things that have been produced by the wisest men."—*Puritan Recorder*.

"We regard it as an admirable addition to our literature, and it must be invaluable to all writers."—*Morning Express*.

"Almost every subject within the range of human thought, is here presented in a brilliant and compact form."—*Ch. Secretary*.

"We have here a great range, embracing almost every leading subject, illuminated and warmed by some bright conception, some exquisite sentiment, some pithy and striking saying of a noble mind in its best mood."—*Bangor Whig*.

POETIC READINGS

For Schools and Families. With an INTRODUCTION. By
J. L. COMSTOCK, M. D., author of "System of Natural
Philosophy," &c. &c.

"This is a selection from some of the choicest poets, in which the best feelings of youth are reflected. It will kindle the interest and fix the attention of the young, and give to the mind a healthful tone."—*The Book Trade.*

"The selection before us is in all respects one of the most valuable, if not the very best, that we have ever met with. It displays fine judgment, admirable taste, and a keen appreciation of the beautiful; while in its moral tone, it is perfectly unexceptionable."—*The Family Friend.*

"We cordially recommend to all young readers this charming collection. It is executed with soundness of judgment, delicacy of taste, and great range of research; and no school ought to be without it."—*Home Journal.*

"The poetry is of the highest moral stamp, of the very character fitted to cultivate intellect and heart."—*Spectator.*

"The collection is from the best pens, the Howitts, Taylors, Bernard Barton, Cowper, and others, "household words," and is made in excellent taste and keeping; and it is a book, out of its very simplicity, in which age can find as much delight and heart nutriment as youth a welcome little volume."—*Literary World.*

"A very handsome collection of choice poems from the first authors. Among them we notice that touching ballad, "The Children in the Wood," John Gilpin, Cassabianca, and a hundred others of equal interest to the young."—*Daily Mercury.*

"Parents and Sabbath School teachers will find this a book from which their children can commit most excellent pieces to memory."—*Watchman and Reflector.*

"These selections of poetry for the young present an admirable mirror, in which they may see their own best feelings reflected, and wherein whatsoever is excellent is set before them in the most attractive form."—*Hunt's Merchant's Magazine.*

SOVEREIGNS OF THE BIBLE.

By ELIZA R. STEELE, Author of "Heroines of Sacred
History," &c. With illuminated title and numerous fine
illustrations. 12mo.

"We have here the scattered facts in the lives of the Kings of Israel and Judah, skillfully arranged into continuous narratives, which are at once highly instructive and deeply monitory."—*Albany Argus.*

"It will give order and distinctness to all previous acquaintance with Jewish history."—*Spectator.*

"It will be a useful and interesting work for the Sunday School and home libraries."—*Newark Daily.*

"The book deserves high commendation, and will be extensively read."—*Home Journal.*

Books Published and for Sale by M. W. Dodd.

From the Presbyterian Magazine.

"Mr. Boyd's work on the Shorter Catechism seems well adapted to **take** with the young. So far as we have examined it, the strictures and inferences are evangelical and judicious; and we hope that Presbyterians will appreciate this effort to promote the study of their standards."

From the New York Baptist Register.

"The book forms a brief but suggestive system of theology, valuable both to the ministry and laity, and in the family circle."

From the Newark Daily Advertiser.

"This little book of Mr. Boyd's is admirably adapted to interest the young in the study of the Catechism, to convey its lessons clearly to their minds, and enforce them on their hearts. We consider it a valuable aid to teachers of Sabbath-schools and Bible classes, and to parents in conducting family instruction."

From the Christian Mirror.

"Mr. Boyd's Commentary is exceedingly well planned and executed; and we think it will prove widely acceptable."

From the New York Observer.

"We hope that this volume, evidently prepared with much care, and giving an analytical view of that monumental compend of divinity, 'The Shorter Catechism,' may be an encouragement to its more diligent study. It is designed for Bible-classes and family instruction, and is very largely provided with proof upon the various doctrines exhibited, and with illustrative extracts, which will make the study more interesting to the young."

From the Boston Traveller.

"This is a most valuable little book, filled with the most important instruction, and enlivened by numerous pertinent anecdotes, illustrative of the doctrines taught."

From the Philadelphia Christian Chronicle.

"The admirers of the Westminster Catechism will be gratified to meet with this edition."

From the Boston Evening Telegraph.

"The plan is original, and just adapted to the wants of the age. The aged, too, will love the Catechism more by familiarity with this volume. The plan of the work has been submitted to some of our most distinguished divines, and they give it their unqualified approval."

From the Literary Scrap Book.

"We hail with pleasure the appearance of the Westminster Shorter Catechism in its present form. . . . No better summary of religious Bible truth can be found or conceived of, than that contained in this Shorter Catechism."

Many other notices have been received of a similar scope and character.

Books Published and for Sale by M. W. Dodd.

ORIENTAL AND SACRED SCENES;

From Notes of Travel in Greece, Turkey and Palestine.
By Fisher Howe. 1 vol. 12mo. Beautifully illustrated with maps and colored engravings, in the highest style of art.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS:

From the New York Independent.

"Few travelers have made so intelligible a report of the East, free from redundancy, accurate and distinct."

From the Journal of Commerce.

"Mr. Howe's Sketches, by their brevity and popular interest, will attract the mass of biblical readers more even than the elaborate researches of Robinson and Smith."

From the Congregationalist (Boston).

"It ought to get within the reach of all parish libraries."

From the Presbyterian Magazine.

"This is a work of rich instruction and uncommon merit. It is published in an elegant style, and deserves a wide circulation."

From the New York Evangelist.

"He travels with the Bible in his hand, and his descriptions often throw striking light upon many difficult passages."

From the Journal and Messenger.

"We welcome the book as a valuable accession to sacred literature."

From the N. H. Palladium.

"A very elegant, entertaining and instructive book."

From Norton's Literary Gazette.

"His style is animated, and his descriptions so graphic and life-like, that the reader seems to be transported to the place which he is describing."

From the Western Literary Magazine.

"This book possesses more than one attraction. The letter-press is superb, the illustrations are numerous and beautiful, and the subject-matter is both agreeable and instructive."

From the N. Y. Christian Intelligencer.

"The volume is full of graphic description and valuable information."

From the Merchant's Magazine.

"It contains much in relation to scenes, manners and customs of the parts visited by the author, that will interest not only the biblical student but the general reader."

THE YOUNG LADY'S GUIDE

To the Harmonious Development of Character. By Rev. HARVEY NEWCOMB. New and improved edition. 12mo.

"It has a high practical, moral, and religious character, and includes in its wide range of topics almost everything that the spirit of parental vigilance and tenderness could dictate. It is an excellent book for parents to put into the hands of their daughters, when they are away from home, especially for purposes of education."—*Puritan Recorder*.

"It takes up in delightful order the various employments of life, and lays down admirable rules for health, reading, meditation, improvement of time, dress, social and relative duties, marriage, &c. The address which closes the volume, on female education, is excellent."—*Albany Spectator*.

"We can most confidently recommend this volume. Among the religious books especially addressed to young ladies, we do not know of a better. It is instructive, discreet, persuasive."—*N. Y. Times*.

"Mr. Newcomb has sought to present the best methods for the development of all the powers, so as to produce the highest degree of cultivation—intellectual, social, moral and religious. It is a work of real merit."—*Nat. Intelligencer*.

"This volume has already passed through a large number of editions, and it well deserves to be a standard work."—*N. Y. Observer*.

"Of all the Guides for young ladies, we do not recollect one that we can more confidently recommend to our young female friends than this volume."—*Richmond Chris. Advocate*.

"There is hardly any condition of life to which it is not applicable, or any young person of either sex that will not derive profit from its attentive perusal."—*Family Friend*.

"The instructions it contains have been adjudged of the highest importance, and have been practically followed out by many who have gratefully acknowledged their happy influences in rescuing them from a life of indifference and fashionable frivolity."—*Godey's Lady's Book*.

"This is a standard treatise on the important subject of which it treats. It may be relied upon as a safe guide to respectability, happiness, and usefulness."—*Religious Herald*.

"Its good sense, kindly spirit, completeness, and the fine ideal of character it proposes, are worthy of admiration."—*Lit. World*.

"This is an elegantly-executed volume of 330 pages. The address on female education is one of peculiar value."—*Chris. Freeman*.

WHAT NOW?

For Young Ladies leaving School. By CHARLES F. DEEMS, President of Greensboro' Female College. N. C. 18mo.

"The young female graduate, or she who is said to have 'finished her education,' will do well to read this little attractive volume."—*Christian Intelligencer*.

"They comprise many important counsels for young ladies, at the very crisis when they need the direction and encouragement of a judicious guide."—*Christian Observer*.

Books Published and for Sale by M. W. Dodd.

A NEW MEMOIR OF HANNAH MORE;

Or, Life in Hall and Cottage. By Mrs. HELEN C. KNIGHT
Embellished with a fine portrait of Mrs. More, and a
view of Barley Wood, her residence, from fine steel en-
gravings. 12mo.

In Mrs. Knight's hands the subject glows and fascinates as though it were a freshest novelty. The style is sparkling and graphic; the arrangement and order of the topics judicious and striking. It is indeed a delightful book; and we think, too, one of the most seasonable that has lately been offered. We commend it to every lady reader especially."—*N. Y. Organ*.

"This memoir is not a mere re-arrangement of old materials, for the sake of making a book; but a fresh, life-like picture of an old scene, in which we discover points of beauty that never struck us before. It is, in reality, the *Life* of Hannah More. She lives it over again under our eyes, and, as it were, for our pleasure and profit."—*Journal of Commerce*.

"This is a volume of rare attractiveness. It is not burdened, as are others, with dry details, and with correspondence heaped together without discrimination, and it will introduce to the young female society of this country and this generation the genius of Barley Wood, in a most winning garb, as a companion, an instructor, and a guide."—*The Independent*.

"We hardly know of a more attractive and suggestive history than Hannah More's; and the presentation of it in a form so well adapted to bring out its best features, and to commend its lessons to the sex of which she was such an ornament, is a great public good, as well as a great matter of literary attraction."—*N. Y. Evangelist*.

"Here is truly as fine a gift book, intrinsically, as one could present or desire. We have been delighted with its contents, and so must be every reader."—*Albany Spectator*.

"There is a neatness and beauty about the mechanical execution of this work which are unusual, and which correspond well with the contents. The leading characteristics of Miss More are justly and forcibly exhibited."—*Genesee Evangelist*.

"The subject of the work is happily presented in all her positions in life. Let daughters in all lands study her character and emulate her virtues."—*Western Lit. Messenger*.

"It is praise enough to say she has fairly set forth her noble heroine in a dress adapted to the popular taste, and at a price which all can command."—*Phil. North American*.

THE FIRST WOMAN.

By GARDINER SPRING, D. D. 18mo.

"It is a luminous outline of the sphere, the peculiarities and duties of woman; an essay on female character, in which he inculcates the virtues which adorn it, and rebukes those features which, in these times, so horribly distort it."—*Southern Methodist Pulpit*.

"It is a beautiful tribute to the female character, and is fitted to act as a powerful auxiliary to female influence."—*Albany Argus*.

"It is worth its weight in gold."—*Fairfax News*.

Books Published and for Sale by M. W. Dodd.

WINTER IN SPITZBERGEN.

A Book for Youth. From the German of C. Hildebrandt.
By E. Goodrich Smith. 16mo.

"An engaging and spirited picture of the marvels and hardships of northern life in winter, in a dialogue form."—*N. Y. Evangelist*.

"A book that cannot fail to please the youthful readers for whom it is intended."—*Sartain's Magazine*.

"The volume is a treasure, and should be in every boy's and girl's library."—*Home Journal*.

"The subjects are varied and attractive, and refer mostly to interesting incidents and stirring scenes and events connected with that frozen region, and the inhospitable climate of the north. Many of them are peculiarly vivid in detail, and startling in their character, and give to the volume an interest which but few such works possess."—*Farmer, Mechanic, and American Cabinet*.

MATRIMONY;

Or, Love Affairs in Our Village Twenty Years Ago. By
MRS. CAUSTIC. 12mo.

"Under the guise of a lively, entertaining tale, most earnest and common-sense lessons are imparted, which young ladies, with heads full of matrimonial speculations, would do well to study. The author has a sharp and attractive pen."—*N. Y. Evangelist*.

"There are passages in this work of the most thrilling truthfulness, and it is, as a whole, more captivating than one out of a thousand novels. Every word in it is true; and we hope that all classes will read it, learn it by heart, and follow the seasonable, healthful, and blessed advice which it gives."—*Albany Spectator*.

"It is an uncommonly well-written and impressive tale, designed and adapted to remedy certain great social evils, and to promote true social refinement and happiness. It holds the mirror true to the human heart."—*Puritan Recorder*.

"We welcome so faithful an expositor of those fashionable follies which are fast obtaining among us."—*Western Lit. Messenger*.

"Especially does this book commend itself to the young Christian, as it develops the follies of a fashionable courtship, a fashionable marriage,—left, because of fashion, destitute of heart, soul, love, beauty or life."—*Baptist Recorder*.

RACHEL KELL.

By the Author of "My Mother," "Scenes and Characters in College," &c.

"A story of peculiar domestic interest, designed to enforce correct principles, and to show that the greatest social disadvantages may be overcome by the steady pursuit of virtuous aims."—*Presbyterian*.

"The story is religious in its tone, is full of interesting incidents, and is calculated to please those who read romances for something nobler than mere excitement."—*Western Lit. Messenger*.

"It is full of charming incidents and beautiful descriptions of life, and will richly repay a perusal, and yield to the thoughtful mind a golden harvest of good."—*Albany Spectator*.

Books Published and for Sale by M. W. Dodd.

SERMONS OF THE REV. I. S. SPENCER, D.D.

Author of "A Pastor's Sketches."

With a Sketch of his Life. By Rev. J. M. Sherwood.
2 vols. 12mo. With fine portrait.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS:

From the Puritan Recorder.

"The wide circulation which his two volumes of Sketches have gained will render these two posthumous volumes of discourses the more universally welcome; and we can assure those who have read the former, no matter with how much delight, that they will be in no danger of disappointment in reading the latter."

From the New York Independent.

"As a whole they are fine specimens of the clear, simple, earnest, faithful preaching of the Gospel. They are good sermons for the family. The memoir is an interesting sketch of a life of industry, diligence and devotion."

From the Daily Courant (Hartford).

"They are rich in thought, clear, discriminating, and sound in doctrine, and withal remarkable for simplicity of style and directness of address. The sketch of Dr. Spencer's Life as drawn by Mr. Sherwood is just, and presents him as an admirable example of pastoral fidelity and great success in 'his work.'"

From the Journal of Commerce.

"A more valuable collection it would be difficult to find. The mere titles are impressive, embracing all the great fundamental truths of the Gospel. Most cordially do we commend these sermons to the attention of the Christian public."

From the New York Observer.

"They are full of the strong, good sense, the powerful logic, and the pointed appeal, which made his preaching so effective."

From the New York Evangelist.

"They are very striking, original, clear and impressive efforts. There is not an ordinary sermon in the volumes; while some of them evince consummate ability. They are instinct with life and power. The memoir prefixed by Mr. Sherwood strikes us as admirable."

From the Christian Chronicle (Philadelphia).

"The sketch of his life and character, and the discourses that are added, give a clear view of this good and useful minister of Christ, and can not be too highly valued. They are a valuable contribution to sacred literature."

From the Christian Observer (Philadelphia).

"These handsome volumes contain a truly valuable addition to the religious literature of our country. They are the works of an able, devoted and eminently useful minister of Christ."

THE HOME ALTAR.

An Appeal in behalf of Family Worship, with Prayers and Hymns for Family Use, and a Calendar of Lessons in Reading the Bible, for every Day in the Year. By CHAS F. DEEMS, editor of "The Southern M. Pulpit." 12mo.

"The Home Altar appears to us to be admirably arranged, and conspicuous throughout for that clearness of style, beauty and strength which Mr. Deems' productions combine in a remarkable degree."—*The Newbernian*.

"The Appeal is in point—able and conclusive in argument—in style clear and concise—in spirit earnest, liberal, and kind. It should be read by all, and especially by heads of families."—*Weekly Review*.

"Heads of families cannot read this little manual without being impressed with the propriety and beauty of daily domestic worship."—*Baptist Memorial*.

"We can cheerfully say, that, as a plea for family worship, it has but few superiors in ordinary circulation; and that, as an aid in performing the duty, it is equal to any that are now before the public."—*Watchman and Observer*.

"It contains a well-digested and forcible argument in favor of the duty of family devotion, in connection with various prayers, and hymns, and Scripture selections, well fitted to aid and guide in its performance."—*Albany Argus*.

"The style of the author is beautifully adapted to the design of the work, and the forms of prayers given breathe a truly humble and penitent spirit."—*Portland Whig and Courier*.

"If the families now neglecting prayer would adopt such a manual of devotion as the one before us, we cannot doubt but it would ensure very much to their spiritual advantage."—*Christian Secretary*.

"This is an excellent work. The Appeal ought to be placed in every house which contains no family altar. It seems impossible to read it, and continue delinquent in regard to the duty in question. The prayers are all catholic and Scriptural."—*S. S. Visitor*.

A COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF PROVERBS.

By MOSES STUART, lately Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass. 1 vol. 12mo.

"This needs nothing more than an announcement to recommend it to every Biblical student. It was the last labor of a most diligent and prayerful student of the Holy Scriptures, a labor performed, not drudgingly and with decaying powers, but with all the sprightly vigor of earlier years, guided by the matured judgment and experience of the lecture-room, and by a household familiarity with the Hebrew tongue. It is characterized by that learned research, acute discrimination, elaborate disquisition, impartial candor, apt expression, and earnest devotion, that mark all the commentaries of the author."—*The Independent*.

THE MERCY SEAT.

THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY THE LORD'S PRAYER.

In this volume intrinsic excellence and mechanical beauty are well combined. Richness and maturity of evangelical thought and sentiment are its characteristics; the ripe experience of a devout Christian clusters on every page; it is full of "marrow and fatness, of wine on the lees well refined." "The Mercy Seat" will be—can not but be—highly prized by Christians of all denominations.—*Com. Advertiser.*

We regard it as the most valuable of all the distinguished author's works. It is a book for the family and the closet, and is equally well adapted to profit the plainest Christian and the most cultivated man of letters.—*N. Y. Observer.*

The volume contains some of his best and most interesting discourses, and cannot fail to be most heartily welcomed by the religious public. The style in which it is published is exceedingly neat and attractive.—*N. Y. Courier and Enquirer.*

It is certainly one of the most favorable exhibitions of Dr. Spring's powers in illustrating and enforcing truths of the highest moment. His theme is a delightful one, and the method of treating it all that could be desired.—*Phil. Presbyterian.*

This work is in Dr. Spring's best style—vigorous, perspicuous, and breathing the true Christian spirit. It is not a book intended simply for the closet. It seizes upon a man in his daily walks—amidst the cares of his business—at his desk or in his workshop, and recalls him to a sense of his divine relations—and is worthy of a place in the choicest niche of the library.—*Journal of Commerce.*

THE ATTRACTION OF THE CROSS.

DESIGNED TO ILLUSTRATE THE LEADING TRUTHS, OBLIGATIONS AND HOPES OF CHRISTIANITY.

It is the ablest and most finished production of its author, and will undoubtedly take its place in that most enviable position in the family, as a volume of standard reading, to be the comfort of the aged, and the guide of the young. We commend it as one of the most valuable issues of the press.—*N. Y. Observer.*

We trust every family in our land will read this precious work, which illustrates so beautifully and attractively the leading truths, obligations and hopes of Christianity, as reflected from the cross of Christ.—*Albany Spectator.*

"The Attraction of the Cross" is destined to live among the very best productions of the church with which its respected author is connected. The style is remarkably pure, the arrangements of the topics lucid and methodical, and the arguments addressed with great force to the reason and conscience. It will stand by the side of "Doddridge's Rise and Progress," "Wilberforce's View," or the "Way of Life," in the libraries of future generations.—*Newark Daily Advertiser.*

None will wonder at the rare success which this volume has won, who have read it. For comprehensiveness of views, beauty of style, and excellence and fervor of devotional feeling, few works have lately appeared that surpass it.—*N. Y. Evangelist.*

Books Published and for Sale by M. W. Dodd.

FIRST THINGS.

By GARDINER SPRING, D. D.

A Series of Lectures on the Great Facts and Moral Lessons first revealed to Mankind. 2 vols. 12mo.

"His Lectures are weighty discussions of the first great revelations to the race, as, God's First Work, the First Man, the First Woman, the First Marriage, the First Sabbath, the First Revolt in Heaven, the First Deceiver, Man's First Sin, the First Promise, &c. It is most beautifully printed, and in every way commends itself well."—*Christian Spectator*.

"Their most remarkable characteristic is the felicity with which they blend the attractive and the instructive. In many parts they are highly imaginative, even poetical; and we recognize in them all the grace and beauty, and even fire, which have characterized the best of the Doctor's earlier productions; and then, on the other hand, they are full of great thoughts, apt illustration, and cogent reasonings."—*N. Y. Observer*.

"This work is characterized by great ingenuity, and considerable beauty of style."—*N. Y. Tribune*.

"Old truths are vindicated, modern errors are exposed, sin is rebuked, and holiness encouraged."—*Genesee Evangelist*.

"The venerable author has seized hold of them with his accustomed clearness of perception and good judgment; and in deducing the important truths they contain, has invested them with surpassing interest. Elegant in style, thorough in discussion, sound in sentiment, and replete with the spirit of reverence and piety, the lectures are among the most attractive religious essays that we have ever met."—*N. Y. Evangelist*.

THE GLORY OF CHRIST,

Illustrated in His Character and History; including the Last Things of his Mediatorial Government. By GARDINER SPRING, D. D. 2 vols.

"In these lectures he elucidates the Glory of Christ's Divine Nature, His Incarnation, His Human Character, His Glory as a Preacher, His Miracles, His Transfiguration, His Humiliation, Resurrection, and Ascension, the Mission of the Spirit, the Character of His Followers, the Wonder of Angels,—His Millennial Reign on Earth, His Glory as Final Judge, in the Destruction of His Enemies, and Christ Himself the Glory of Heaven. Such are the topics, around which he has skillfully gathered the lights of the Bible, teaching, what every reader should understand, that Christ is the great central light and glory of the Sacred Volume, giving significance to every part of its contents."—*Christian Observer*.

"The themes are noble. They are treated, too, with so much fulness, glowing earnestness, deep spiritual insight, and, withal, so much adherence to the revelation of God, that they instruct and enlighten while they animate and exalt the mind."—*N. Y. Observer*.

"The work will find its way into the library of thousands of laymen as well as clergymen, for it may be read with profit and interest by all who are desirous of seeing 'the glory of Christ' promoted in the earth."—*Christian Secretary*.

SHORT SERMONS FOR THE PEOPLE.

The following are the topics of this volume, believed to be eminently calculated for universal circulation as a work on the great practical truths of Christianity:—God Almighty. The Sabbath at Sea. The Sinner's Friend. Unbelievers without Hope. The Curse of Abandonment reluctantly executed. Sin detected and exposed. The Great Alternative. Fear relieved by trust in God. The terms of discipleship. The brazen Serpent. All is well. Remembrance of Sin. Running for the Prize. Aggravations of Sin. Conscious integrity a preservative from evil. Death on board the Ship. Restraining Prayer. The fear of God the great preservative from Sin. The wanderer restored. God's call refused. The night of tears, and the morning of joy. Room enough yet. The goodness of God in prolonging human life. True and false repentance. The excuses of men their condemnation. Scriptural views of Christ.

In this volume the author has given us twenty-six sermons, imbued with the spirit of Christian zeal, and of a highly finished, as well as practical character.—*Christian Intelligencer.*

These sermons are evangelical in sentiment, familiar, plain and earnest in manner, presenting themes for thought and action, well adapted to rivet the claims of the gospel on the minds of all.—*Christ. Observer.*

Dr. Spring has a happy versatility of pastoral talent, and has done the cause of religion much service by the variety and worth of his publications. The present is an earnest, ornate, and practical enforcement of religious truths, which will make it generally acceptable and useful.—*Religious Recorder.*

He has presented the Christian World with a volume of sermons, deserving a place in the library of every minister and every family.—*Baptist Register.*

**THE POWER OF THE PULPIT:
OR, THOUGHTS ADDRESSED TO CHRISTIAN MINISTERS
AND THOSE WHO HEAR THEM.**

It is impossible that any Christian minister should not be interested in this volume of Dr. Spring. It is rich in thought, various and forcible in illustration, and glowing with the fervor of scriptural piety.—*Christian Mirror.*

We believe the volume before us contains many hints from which the most successful ministers might profit much.—*Mich. Christ. Her.*

It contains a mass of solid learning, interesting and varied information, and eloquent appeals in relation to the sacred arrangement of the pulpit. The style of the work is as elegant and chaste as its matter is serious and important.—*Presbyterian Treasury.*

Sound in doctrine, pure, strong and elevated in his diction, solemn in manner, with versatility, with compass of information and thought, and, above all, with a heart deeply enlisted in his sacred calling, he possesses rare qualifications for the work he has here undertaken.—*Reflector and Watchman.*

To all men, clerical and lay, we commend this work, not only for its truth, but for the beauty of its style, and the force of its arguments, and its adaptation to meet a great want in every part of our country.—*Independent.*

BV

234523

811

Hunt

.H9

Bible baptist

1- 2112

BV811.H9 c.1

Bible Baptist No 1 or What does the



090 236 251

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO