

WRITINGS OF JAMES M PENDLETON

by James M. Pendleton

A collection of theological writings, sermons, and essays by James M. Pendleton, compiled for study and devotional reading.

17 Chapters

Table of Contents

1. 01.00. Church Manual
2. 01.01. Chapter 1
3. 01.02. Chapter 2
4. 01.03. Chapter 3
5. 01.04. Chapter 4
6. 01.05. Chapter 5
7. 01.06. Chapter 6
8. 01.07. Chapter 7
9. 01.08. Appendixes
10. 01.08.01. Appendix 1
11. 01.08.02. Appendix 2
12. 01.08.03. Appendix 3
13. 01.08.04. Appendix 4
14. 02.1. CHAPTER 1. BAPTISTS REGARD THE BAPTISM OF UNCONSCIOUS INFANTS AS UNSCR...
15. 02.2. CHAPTER 2. BAPTISTS CONSIDER THE IMMERSION IN WATER OP A BELIEVER IN C...
16. 02.3. CHAPTER 3. BAPTISTS HOLD THAT, ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURAL ORDER, PERS...
17. 02.4. CHAPTER 4. BAPTISTS BELIEVE THAT A SCRIPTURAL CHURCH IS A LOCAL CONGRE...

01.00. Church Manual

CHURCH MANUAL DESIGNED FOR THE USE OF BAPTIST CHURCHES By James Madison Pendleton, D.D. (1811-1891) Let all things be done decently and in order. - 1 Corinthians 14:40
THE JUDSON PRESS

PHILADELPHIA CHICAGO ? KANSAS CITY ? LOS ANGELES ? SEATTLE Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1867, by the AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY In the Clerk's Office of the United States District Court in and for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania First Printing 1867 150th thousand, 1946

CONTENTS Chapter 1 Nature of a Church Chapter 2 Officers of a Church Chapter 3 Doctrines of a Church Chapter 4 Ordinances of a Church Chapter 5 The Government of a Church Chapter 6 The Discipline of a Church Chapter 7 Duties of a Church

APPENDIX I. Business Meetings of a Church II. Forms of Minutes, Letters, etc.

III. Marriage Ceremony IV. Province of Associations and Councils

01.01. Chapter 1

CHURCH MANUAL

CHAPTER I NATURE OF A CHURCH The term Church occurs in the New Testament more than a hundred times. The word thus translated means congregation or assembly; but it does not indicate the purpose for which the congregation or assembly meets. Hence it is used, Acts 19:32, Acts 19:39, Acts 19:41, and rendered assembly. In every other place in the New Testament it is translated church. In its application to the followers of Christ, it refers either to a particular congregation of saints, or to the redeemed in the aggregate. It is employed in the latter sense in Ephesians 1:22; Ephesians 3:21; Ephesians 5:25, Ephesians 5:27. Here we have the expressions, "Head over all things to the Church;" "To him be glory in the Church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages world without end;" "Christ loved the Church and gave himself for it ... that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." In these passages, and a few more like them, it would be absurd to define the term Church as meaning a particular congregation of Christians, meeting in one place for the worship of God. Our business, however, is with the other signification of the word church. In a large majority of instances it is used in the Scriptures to denote a local assembly, convened for religious purposes. Thus we read of "the church at Jerusalem," "the church of God which is at Corinth," "the church of the Thessalonians," "the church of Ephesus," "the church in Smyrna," "the church in Pergamus," etc., etc. Nor are we to suppose that it required a large number of persons to constitute a church. Paul refers to Aquila and Priscilla and "the church that is in their house," to Nymphas and "the church which is in his house," and in his letter to Philemon he says, "to the church in thy house." A congregation of saints, organized according to the New Testament, whether that congregation is large or small, is a church. The inspired writers, as if to preclude the idea of a church commensurate with a province, a kingdom, or an empire, make use of the following forms of expression, "the churches of Galatia," "the churches of Macedonia," "the churches of Asia," "the churches of Judea"; but they never say the church of Galatia, the church of Macedonia, etc. Wherever Christianity prevailed in apostolic times there was a plurality of churches. In answer to the question, What is a church? it may be said: A church is a congregation of Christ's baptized disciples, acknowledging him as their Head, relying on his atoning sacrifice for justification before God, and depending on the Holy Spirit for sanctification, united in the belief of the gospel, agreeing to maintain its ordinances and obey its precepts, meeting together for worship, and cooperating for the extension of Christ's kingdom in the world. If any prefer an abridgment of the definition it may be given thus: A church is a congregation of Christ's baptized disciples, united in the belief of what he has said, and covenanting to do what he has commanded.

If this be a correct description of a church of Christ, it is manifest that membership must be preceded by important qualifications. These qualifications may be considered as moral and ceremonial.

MORAL. Among moral Prerequisites to church-membership may be mentioned

Repentance. John the Baptist, whose ministry was "the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ," preached, saying to the people, "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." His was the baptism of repentance. When John was cast into prison Jesus "came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye and believe the gospel." When the apostles were sent forth they "preached that men should repent." The Lord Jesus after his resurrection said: "Thus it is written and thus it behooved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations." Peter on the day of Pentecost said, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins"; and Paul, who testified at Ephesus for three years "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," proclaimed in Athens, "God commandeth all men everywhere to repent." The New Testament is full of the doctrine of repentance. It is a doctrine of the gospel. The law knows nothing of it. The language of the law is, Do and live—not Repent, that you may be pardoned. Repentance involves such a change of mind in regard to sin as is indispensable to a proper appreciation of the blessings of the kingdom of Christ. Hence no impenitent sinner can constitutionally enter into the kingdom. There is no place more inappropriate for the impenitent than a church of Christ.

Faith. This is another moral qualification for church-membership. Great importance is in the Scriptures attached to faith in Christ, as will appear from the following passages: "He that believeth on him is not condemned." "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." "These things are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life through his name." "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "By him all that believe are justified from all things." "Whom God hath set forth as a propitiation through faith in his blood . . . that he might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ."

These passages, with many others, clearly show that in the economy of the gospel faith in Christ is recognized as an essential principle. Why is this? Not because faith is a meritorious exercise. There is, there can be, no merit in it. This is evident, because faith is a duty, and there can be no merit in the performance of a duty. But, while faith possesses no merit, it brings the soul into vital contact with the blood of atonement, which possesses infinite merit. It unites to Christ. Its province is to receive Christ, and with him all the blessings of the "new covenant." Christ is emphatically the object of faith. The faith which avails to salvation has respect to him and embraces him.

Faith in Christ—the faith which instrumentally achieves the sinner's justification before God—is an essential qualification for church-membership. No unbeliever has the shadow of a claim to citizenship in the kingdom of Christ. The formal mention of regeneration as a prerequisite to church-membership has been omitted, because it necessarily coexists with repentance and faith. Every penitent believer is a regenerate person. Regeneration is the spiritual process by which we become new creatures in Christ—are born again—born of the Spirit—born of God—quickened together with Christ—renewed after the image of God, etc., etc. "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus," is the language of Paul to the Galatians; and the beloved disciple says, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God." If faith therefore, as we have seen,

is a qualification for church membership, regeneration must be also; for it is so inseparable from faith, that every one who believes in Christ is born of God. And it follows, that if faith is a prerequisite to baptism, regeneration is likewise. This being the case, regeneration does not occur in baptism.

Let it never be forgotten that the only suitable materials of which to construct a church of Christ, so far as spiritual qualifications are concerned, are regenerate, penitent, believing persons. To make use of other materials is to subvert the fundamental principles of church organization. It is to destroy the kingdom of Christ; for how can there be a kingdom without subjects? such subjects as the King requires ?

It is a regulation of the Head of the Church that his spiritual subjects be organized into visible, local communities. We read therefore, in the New Testament, of churches? another name for these communities. There are frequent references to local congregations. These congregations had a regular, visible organization; and there must have been some visible, act of initiation into them. What was it? This leads to a consideration of

2. The ceremonial qualification for church membership. This qualification is baptism. There can, according to the Scriptures, be no visible church without baptism. An observance of this ordinance is the believer's first public act of obedience to Christ. Regeneration, repentance, and faith are private matters between God and the soul. They involve internal piety, but of this piety there must be an external manifestation. This manifestation is made in baptism. The penitent, regenerate believer is baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. There is a visible, symbolic expression of a new relationship to the three persons of the Godhead? a relationship entered into in repentance, faith, and regeneration. We are said to be baptized into the death of Christ. We profess our reliance on his death for salvation; and we emblematically declare that as he died for sin, so we have died to sin, and have risen from our death in trespasses and sins to newness of life. We solemnly commemorate the burial and resurrection of the Lord Jesus, and are ourselves symbolically buried to the world. In baptism our sins are declaratively remitted? formally washed away. Washing in water frees the body from literal impurity. Baptism is a symbolic release of the soul from the defilement of sin. There is an actual, a real remission of sins when we believe in Christ? there is a declarative, formal, symbolic remission in baptism. That the views, now presented, of the moral and ceremonial qualifications for church membership are in accordance with the New Testament will be seen by referring to the commission of Christ, as understood and executed by the apostles, on the day of Pentecost. The commission said, ?Go, teach [make disciples of] all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you.? A great awakening took place under Peter's preaching, and repenting thousands accepted salvation through Christ. It is added, ?Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls.? Subsequently it is said, ?The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved.? The converts to the faith were first baptized and then added to the church. This shows baptism to be prerequisite to church-membership. It was so regarded at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, when the apostles began to act under the commission of their risen Lord; and it is morally certain it was so regarded wherever they established churches. And as churches in all ages must be formed after the apostolic model, it follows that where penitent, regenerate, baptized believers in Christ are found, there are scriptural

materials for a church. Such persons having first given themselves to the Lord, and then to one another, in solemn covenant, agreeing to make the will of Christ as expressed in his word their rule of action, are, in the New Testament sense of the term, a church. Whether they are many or few in number, they are a church. But in the absence of penitent, regenerate, baptized believers in Christ, there cannot be a New Testament church.

CONSTITUTION OF CHURCHES When the interests of Christ's kingdom require the formation of a new church the customary mode of procedure is about this: Brethren and sisters obtain letters of dismission from the church or churches to which they belong, for the purpose of entering into the new organization. It is well for this purpose to be stated in the letters. When they meet together at the appointed time, a Moderator and Clerk pro tem are appointed. The meeting is opened with devotional exercises. Sometimes a sermon is preached, especially when it is not intended to have recognition services at some future day. Reading the Scriptures and prayer should be considered indispensable. This being done, the letters of dismission are read, and the parties concerned resolve by solemn vote to consider themselves an independent church. What is called a church covenant is adopted, as also Articles of Faith. These Articles of Faith are not intended as, in any sense, a substitute for the word of God; but only as an expression of the views of the constituent members as to the prominent teachings of the Scriptures. It is very important to the peace, efficiency, and usefulness of a church that there be among its members substantial harmony of sentiment as to what the Bible teaches. Differences of opinion on little matters, so regarded, have sometimes illustrated the truth of the inspired exclamation, "Behold, how great a matter a little fire kindleth !" It would have saved hundreds of churches a great deal of trouble, if they had remembered, at the right time, that neither two nor any other number, can walk together, except they be agreed. Ordinarily, a church at the time of its constitution, selects a name by which it is to be designated, and appoints its officers. This, however, is not indispensable. It is sometimes best, for prudential reasons, to defer the election of officers.

RECOGNITION OF CHURCHES The same importance is not to be attached to the recognition as to the constitution of a church. It is not necessary to the validity of church organization. Still, the advantages resulting from a suitable recognition should not be lightly esteemed. It adds much to the influence of a new church to be cordially endorsed and welcomed into the sisterhood of churches. This is usually done by a council of recognition, composed of ministers and others from churches in the vicinity. Sometimes councils examine very closely the facts connected with the formation of new churches, Articles of Faith, etc.; but generally are so well satisfied as to make no special investigation. Recognition services usually embrace Reading the Scriptures, Prayer, Sermon, giving the Hand of Fellowship, and a Charge to the Church.

HOW MEMBERS ARE RECEIVED There are two ways of receiving members into a church.

1. By Experience and Baptism.
2. By Letters of Dismission from sister churches.

In accordance with the first way, persons wishing to unite with a church give an account of the dealings of God with their souls, and state the "reason of the hope that is in them"; where upon, if, in the judgment of the church they "have passed from death unto life," they are by vote of the church recognized, as candidates for baptism, with the understanding that when baptized they will be entitled to all the rights and privileges of membership. Great care should be exercised in receiving members. Many churches err at this point. They do not observe the requisite caution; for they receive persons who

give, to say the least, very imperfect evidence of piety. There is much danger of this, especially in times of religious excitement. Pastors should positively assure themselves that those who are received for baptism have felt themselves to be guilty, ruined, helpless sinners, justly condemned by God's holy law; and under a sense of their lost condition have trusted in Christ for salvation. After baptism—usually at the first celebration of the Lord's Supper—it is the general, and should be the universal custom for the pastor to give the hand of fellowship to the newly baptized, in token of their having been received into full membership. This affords the pastor a suitable opportunity of saying something as to the import and obligations of the Christian profession. The other way of becoming members of a church is by presenting Letters of Dismission from sister churches. These letters affording satisfactory proof of their Christian character and standing, the applicants for membership are received and the hand of fellowship given, as in the former case. It is proper to say that by sister churches are meant churches of similar faith and order. Hence no Baptist church can receive and recognize, as a passport to membership, a letter from any Pedobaptist organization. There is such a lack of similar faith and order as to render this utterly inadmissible. It sometimes happens that persons who have been baptized where there is no church, and persons who, owing to the extinction of the church to which they belonged, or to other circumstances, find themselves without regular Letters of Dismission, wish to enjoy the privileges of membership. In such cases it is only necessary for the church applied to be satisfied of the worthiness of the applicants, and they are received.

HOW MEMBERSHIP CEASES Membership in a church terminates in three ways.

1. By Death. The dead can have no place in any earthly congregation of the saints.
2. By Exclusion. A church has the right, according to the Scriptures, and is under obligation to exclude from its fellowship any member who holds heretical doctrines, or lives inconsistently with the Christian profession. More will be said on this subject in the Chapter on Discipline.
3. By Dismission. Letters of Dismission granted to members who apply for them, provided they are in good standing. The fact that disciplinary proceedings have not been instituted against a member is generally to be taken as an evidence of good standing; and, therefore, of a right to a letter of dismission. There are, however, some exceptional cases. A member who asks for a letter of dismission with the purpose of evading church discipline, because he has reason to expect it, has no right to a letter. Such a case must be investigated. The general rule would be to grant a letter to the member who asks for it, provided he would not be subject to discipline if he did not ask for it. The time at which a dismissed member ceases to be a member depends on the church that grants the letter. Some churches consider the connection as terminated as soon as a letter is granted. The great majority of churches, however, and very properly, regard dismissed members as under their jurisdiction until they are received into other churches. Some churches have a way of getting clear of members by a process which is called "dropping." This is considered less disgraceful than exclusion, and is resorted to chiefly in the case of members who for a long time, willingly, absent themselves from the meetings of the church, or have gone, the church knows not where. The dropping process is unnecessary. It differs but little from exclusion—not at all in its effects. That is to say, the dropped as well as the excluded are no longer church-members. It may be said too, that members who habitually stay away from the house of God deserve exclusion, as do those who, not prizing church privileges as they ought, emigrate to other places without asking for

Letters of Dismission.

01.02. Chapter 2

CHAPTER II OFFICERS OF A CHURCH

It cannot be said that officers are essential to the existence of a church, for a church must exist before it can appoint its officers. After this appointment, if, in the providence of God, they should be removed by death, it might affect the interests, but not the being of the church. It has been well said by an able writer, that "although officers are not necessary to the being of a church, they are necessary to its well-being." No church can reasonably expect to prosper which does not obey the law of its Head in regard to the appointment of officers. It is obvious too, from the teachings of the New Testament, that pastors and deacons are the permanent officers of Christian churches. Paul, referring to Christ's ascension gifts, says: "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ" (Ephesians 4:11-12). Apostles, prophets, and evangelists filled extraordinary and temporary offices. There are no such offices now. Pastors and teachers, the same men, are the ordinary and permanent spiritual officers of the churches, while the office of deacon has special reference to the secular interests of churches. Of these officers in order:

I. PASTOR. This term was first applied to ministers having oversight of churches, because there is a striking analogy between such a minister and a literal shepherd. A shepherd has under his charge a flock, for which he must care, and for whose wants he must provide. The sheep and the lambs must be looked after. The Lord Jesus, "the great Shepherd of the sheep," the chief Shepherd, virtually says to all his under-shepherds, as he did to Peter, "Feed my sheep," "Feed my lambs." It is worthy of remark that this language was not addressed to Peter till the Saviour obtained from him an affirmative answer to the question three times propounded, "Lovest thou me?" As if he had said, "I love my spiritual flock so well. I cannot entrust the sheep and lambs composing it to any man who does not love me." And love to Christ must be regarded in all ages and in all places as the pastor's supreme qualification. All other qualifications are worthless if this is absent. Talent and learning are not to be undervalued; but they must be kept under the control of piety, and receive its sanctifying impress. With regard to the pastoral office, there are two things worthy of special consideration.

I. The Work of Pastors. Truly theirs is a work. Paul says, "If any man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work." It is indeed a good work "the best work on earth" but a work. We must not suffer the term bishop to suggest any such idea as the word in its modern acceptation implies. In apostolic times there were no bishops having charge of the churches of a district or country, a province, or a kingdom. A bishop was a pastor of a church, and the New Testament, so far from encouraging a plurality of churches under one pastor, refers, in two instances at least, to a plurality of pastors in one church. (See Acts 20:28; Php 1:1.) In the former passage the elders of the church at Ephesus are called overseers, and the word thus translated is the same rendered bishop in Php 1:1; 1 Timothy 3:2; Titus 1:7; 1 Peter 2:25. Thus does it appear that pastor, bishop, and

elder are three terms designating the same office. This view is further confirmed by a reference to 1 Peter 5:1-2, where elders are exhorted to feed the flock ? that is, to perform the office of pastor or shepherd ? taking the oversight thereof, etc. ? that is, acting the part of bishops or overseers. For the word translated taking the oversight belongs to the same family of words as the term rendered bishop in the passages cited. It is plain, therefore, that a pastor's work is the spiritual oversight of the flock, the church he serves. Like a good literal shepherd he must care for the feeble and the sick, as well as for the healthy and the vigorous. Some he can feed with ?strong food,? while others can digest nothing stronger than ?milk.? He must exercise a sanctified discretion, and ?study to show himself approved to God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.? Much depends on dividing the word of truth rightly; and hence the necessity of study ? prayerful study, imbued with the spirit of the Master. The administration of ordinances as well as the preaching of the word is the proper business of the pastor. It does not accord with the plan of this volume to elaborate any topic, and therefore the work of the pastor cannot be enlarged on, nor is there room to present the many motives to pastoral fidelity. The mention of two must suffice: the church, over whose interest the pastor watches, has been ?bought with the precious blood of Christ ?; and the faithful pastor will, when ?the chief Shepherd? comes, ?receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.? What motives to diligence and faithfulness could possess more exhaustless power!

2. The Authority of Pastors. All things earthly are liable to abuse, and that feature of congregational church government which places all the members on an equality in the transaction of church business, has been, in some instances at least, suffered to interfere with the deference due to pastors. There is a class of Scriptures whose import is not sufficiently considered ? such as the following: ?And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labor among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake.? ?Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine.? ?Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken to you the word of God.? ?Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account.? In these passages pastors are referred to, and there is claimed for them an authority not belonging to other church-members. They are to be esteemed highly for their work's sake. Whatever esteem their personal merits may excite, they are to be chiefly esteemed for the great and glorious work in which they are engaged. On account of this work they are to be regarded worthy of ?double honor,? that is, special honor. This surely is reasonable, for pastors are chosen by the churches over which they preside. The churches act voluntarily, and the love which prompts the choice of a pastor should secure for him reverential respect in the performance of his duties. The words rule. obey, and submit in the foregoing quotations mean something. The ruling is not unrestricted, neither is the obedience and submission. The pastor is to rule in accordance with the law of Christ. No other kind of rule is legitimate or obligatory; but when he rules in accordance with the will of Christ, obedience and submission on the part of the members of the church are imperative duties. Andrew Fuller well says, ?It is in this view, as teaching divine truth, and enforcing divine commands, that the servants of God, in all ages, have been invested with divine authority.?

Distinguished scholars are of opinion that the two passages quoted, which refer to ruling, should be translated thus: ?Remember your leaders,? etc. ?Obey your leaders,? etc. Admitting the

correctness of this rendering ? and it cannot be denied ? still the idea would not be essentially different. Pastors in leading their flocks do, in one sense, rule them; and in the only sense in which they should rule them. While the proper exercise of pastoral authority is essential to the spiritual welfare of a church, pastors must beware of assuming a power which does not belong to them.

They must remember the words of Peter: ?Neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being examples to the flock.? There must be, in the exercise of pastoral authority, nothing like priestly lordship or clerical despotism; but the influence of pastors must grow out of the fact that they faithfully obey the will of Christ, the great Shepherd, and thus set an example worthy of imitation. There is nothing which gives a pastor so much influence as unreserved consecration to the work of the Lord. As the influence of judicious pastors increases the more they are known, the pastoral relation should be rendered as permanent as possible. It should not be dissolved for any slight cause. As to the custom of some churches that choose their pastors annually, it would be difficult to say too much in condemnation of it. It is vastly injurious both to pastors and churches. Pastors should be chosen for an indefinite period. If the work of the Lord prospers under their labors, well; if they find after a sufficient trial, that they are not accomplishing good, let them resign.

II. DEACONS. The office of deacon originated in a state of things referred to in the sixth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. It is said that ?when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations.? The ?Grecians? were Jews as well as the Hebrews, but they spoke the Greek language, and were probably not natives of Palestine. The members of the church at Jerusalem ?had all things in common,? and a distribution was made out of the common stock ?as every man had need.? This seems to have been done at first under the immediate direction of the apostles; and the intimation is that the large increase of the church interfered with an impartial distribution of supplies. The apostles saw that, if they made it their personal business to ?serve tables,? it would greatly hinder their work in its spiritual aspects. They said: ?It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables; wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Spirit and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business, but we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word."

Thus the creation of the office of deacon recognizes the fact that the duties of pastors are preeminently spiritual; and that they should not be burdened with the secular interests of the churches. The opinion has been entertained by some that the deaconship was designed to be temporary. The argument is that the office was created because the property of the church at Jerusalem had been thrown together into a common stock. and it was requisite to have officers to superintend and distribute it. Then the inference is drawn, that when the property of church-members was no longer put into a common stock, the office of deacon was virtually abolished. This reasoning is more plausible than conclusive. In proof of this it may be said, that the members of the church at Jerusalem were not required to put their property into a common stock. It was a voluntary matter. Nor is there an intimation in the New Testament that any church, except the one at Jerusalem, ever adopted the common-stock regulation. It was, doubtless, considered by that church a prudential arrangement, which involved temporary expediency rather than permanent principle. That the church at Antioch did not follow the example of the church at Jerusalem, in relation to this matter, is evident from Acts 11:29. ?Then the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief to the brethren who dwelt in Judea.? This

individual determination shows that the property of the church was not in "common stock." And Paul's direction to the church at Corinth (1 Corinthians 16:2) indicates that the Jerusalem policy had not been adopted. The same apostle too, in his letter to the Philippians, and to Timothy, refers to deacons. There was, therefore, a recognition of the deaconship when there was, so far as we know, no common property regulation. And more than this, the irresistible inference from Paul's first Epistle to Timothy, is that the office of deacon is as permanent as that of pastor. No one doubts that the office of pastor is to be perpetuated to the end of time. The conclusion is that the deaconship is permanent in the churches of Christ, and that pastors and deacons are the only permanent Scriptural church officers. The words "men of honest report, full of the Holy Spirit, and wisdom" applied to the first deacons, indicates that they were men of unblemished reputation, ardent piety, and good common sense. These qualifications should be sought in all who are appointed to the office of deacon. The phrase, "full of the Holy Spirit," is an admirable description of fervent, elevated piety; and in the selection of deacons their spirituality must be regarded, for their duties are not exclusively secular. Their secular duties, however, should be performed in a spiritual frame of mind; and in this way they purchase to themselves a good degree, and obtain great boldness in the faith. In visiting the pious poor, to distribute the charities of the church, deacons must not perform the duty in a formal manner, but must inquire into the spiritual as well as the worldly circumstances of the recipients of the church's bounty. They will often witness such an exhibition of faith, patience, gratitude, and resignation as will richly repay them for their labor of love. As occasion may require, they should report to the pastor such cases as need his special attention, and thus they will become a connecting link between the pastor and the needy ones of the church. As deacons were appointed at first "to serve tables," it may be well to say, there are three tables for them to serve: 1. The table of the poor. 2. The table of the Lord. 3. The table of the pastor. The pecuniary supplies to enable them to serve these tables must be furnished by the church. The custom of taking a collection for the poor when the Lord's Supper is administered is a good one, and worthy of universal adoption. It is suitable at the close of the solemn service to think of the pious poor, whom sickness or some other misfortune may have kept from the sacred feast. As some pecuniary expenditure is necessary in furnishing the table of the Lord, this should be made through the deacons; and it is eminently proper, though not indispensable, for them to wait on the communicants in the distribution of the elements.

Deacons must serve the pastor's table. It is not for them to decide how liberally or scantily it shall be supplied. The church must make the decision, and enlarged views should be taken when it is made; for the energies of hundreds of pastors are greatly impaired by an incompetent support. The pastor's compensation having been agreed on by the church, the deacons must see that it is raised and paid over. They may appoint one of their number acting treasurer, who shall receive and pay out funds; but it should never be forgotten that deacons are by virtue of their office the treasurers of the church. To appoint any other member to act as treasurer is not warranted by Scripture. As all pecuniary expenditures are to be made through deacons, they should at the end of every year make a report to the church what moneys they have received during the year, how they have been expended, etc. This will keep everything straight and plain, while it will have no little to do with a church's influence and efficiency.

Deacons should be appointed for an indefinite period, and set apart to their office by prayer and the laying on of hands. It is much to be regretted that many churches hold very loose views on

these points. They attach very little importance to the diaconate, and seem to regard it very much as a clerkship or a trusteeship. Indeed a few churches, to their shame be it said, elect their deacons annually; and of one of them it was once said: "Nearly every male member in it has at some time acted as deacon." This amounts almost to a degradation of the diaconate. And those holding these views and indorsing this practice consistently oppose the ordination of deacons. They see not the propriety of ordaining men to an office to which they attach so little importance. Let deacons be chosen for an indefinite period and then let them be solemnly ordained according to the example given in Acts 6:6. "When they had prayed, they laid their hands on them." Prayer is appropriate on all occasions, and laying on of hands is a token of designation to office. Some object to laying on of hands, supposing the design of this ceremony in apostolic times was the communication of the Holy Spirit. That the Spirit was sometimes given in connection with the imposition of hands is evident from Acts 8:17; but the first deacons were chosen because they were already "full of the Holy Spirit." Therefore the laying on of hands was not for the purpose of conferring the Holy Spirit, but of designating to office. This is the object of the ceremony now, and no one who has scriptural views supposes there is a bestowal of extraordinary gifts. It is the custom in some places to lay on hands in ordination during prayer. This is not according to scriptural example. Whenever prayer and laying on of hands are referred to in connection with each other, as in Acts 6:6; Acts 13:3, it is evident that prayer was first offered then followed imposition of hands to be seen and known as a designation to office, but which could not without a violation of propriety be seen during prayer. It is very desirable that all the churches adopt the practice of ordaining deacons by prayer and the laying on of hands. It adds to the influence of the diaconate when induction into it is accompanied by appropriate services.

While pastors and deacons are the only permanent scriptural church officers, it is a prudential arrangement in all churches to have a clerk; and owing to the requirements of the civil law in some places, it is necessary to have trustees. The business of the clerk of a church is, of course, to keep a record of the proceedings of the body. To secure accuracy in the record, at every business meeting the proceedings of the previous meeting should be read, corrected (if correction is necessary), and approved by the church. Trustees are generally the legal custodians of the church property, and are chosen by the church. They have an official existence, because by civil statute it is required that the legal right to property be vested in individuals. It follows, therefore, that the manner of appointing trustees depends on the nature of the civil statute regulating the matter, and may be different in different States. If the statute permits the church to choose all the trustees, it is so done. If the congregation is permitted to have an agency in the election, then most probably the church will select so many and the congregation so many. This will depend, as has been said, on the civil statute. Most usually the church selects the whole number, and chooses from its own membership, which is the better plan. The province of trustees is quite restricted. They have nothing to do with the spiritual affairs of the church. They cannot control the house of worship, saying how it shall be used, or who shall preach in it, and who shall not. The church must do all this. As church-members the trustees may with other members decide what shall be done with church property, whether the house of worship shall be sold and another built, etc., etc.; but as trustees they can do nothing in these matters. When the church so orders, they may convey or receive title to property, sue in the courts, etc.. but their business as trustees is exclusively secular. They cannot in the capacity of trustees perform any spiritual function. A practical remembrance of this fact would have saved not a few churches from trouble.

It is said that in some churches the trustees fix the salaries of pastors; and from time to time increase or diminish them according to their pleasure?that they employ choirs, buy organs, engage sextons, etc., etc. All this is utterly indefensible. Trustees have not a particle of right to do these things. The government of a church is with its members. The churches must say what pastors' salaries shall be, whether music shall be led by choirs, with the aid of instruments or not, etc., etc. Nothing must be done which infringes the fundamental doctrine of church independence. It is well worthy of the consideration of the churches whether they should have trustees distinct from deacons. Would it not be better for every church to merge its trusteeship into its deaconship? We do not hesitate to answer this question in the affirmative. Trustees attend to some of the secular interests of the churches, and all these interests should be under the management of the deacons. They were appointed originally for this very purpose, and a full discharge of the duties of their office would supersede the necessity of trustees. Should the churches practically adopt this view, it might be necessary, in some cases, to increase the number of deacons. This could be done. The probability too is that the plan here recommended would secure a better deaconship in many churches; for they make it a point to select their best business men for trustees. These are the very men for deacons. But the supreme argument in favor of this arrangement is, that it is scriptural, while there is no scriptural authority for trustees as distinct officers.

01.03. Chapter 3

CHAPTER III DOCTRINES OF A CHURCH The phrase, doctrines of a church, is somewhat equivocal in its import. It may mean what a church teaches, or what a church believes the Bible to teach. It is here used in the latter sense. All who believe the Scriptures to be divinely inspired consider them the fountain of religious truth. The Bible contains the revelation of God to man. It is the supreme standard of faith and practice. Whatever conforms to this standard is right-whatever deviates from it is wrong. It is a duty incumbent upon all to "search the Scriptures" and learn what they teach. This duty cannot be faithfully performed unless prejudices and preconceived opinions are laid aside. Alas, how few study the Bible in this way. But for human imperfection there would doubtless be uniformity of belief as to what the Scriptures teach. There is not uniformity, but a deplorable variety of religious opinion throughout Christendom. Different sects, professing to take the word of God as their guide, contend as earnestly for their distinctive views as if they had different Bibles. Various constructions are placed on the teachings of the sacred volume, and multitudes of passages are diversely interpreted. Owing to the unfortunate fact, though belief of the Bible is significant as between the religionist and the infidel, it signifies nothing as between those who receive the Scriptures as the word of God. For they differ as to the import of the inspired Oracles; and the meaning of the Bible is the Bible. As there is such diversity of opinion the religious world, it is eminently proper for those who appeal to the Scriptures as the fountain of truth to declare what they believe the Scriptures to teach. To say that they believe the Scriptures is to say nothing to the purpose. All will say this, and yet all differ as to the teachings of the Bible. There must be some distinctive declaration. What a man believes the Bible to teach is his Creed, either written or unwritten. And though it has sometimes been said that creeds have produced differences of religious opinion, it would be nearer to the truth, logically and historically, to say that differences of religious opinion have produced creeds. As to declarations of faith, it must ever be understood that they are not substitutes for the Scriptures. They are only exponents of what are conceived to be the fundamental doctrines of the word of God. Among Baptist, as their churches are independent, it is optional with each church to have a declaration or not, as it may think best. Each church too may adopt a declaration of its own. Its independence gives it this right, nor can it be alienated. While Baptists glory in their form of church government-which recognizes every church as a little republic in itself- they are perhaps as nearly united in their views of the truths of the Bible as most other denominations. The following Declaration of Faith expresses, substantially, what Baptists believe concerning the topics mentioned.

(This Declaration of Faith was framed many years ago by J. Newton Brown, D.D.) DECLARATION OF FAITH I. OF THE SCRIPTURES

We believe that the Holy Bible was written by men divinely inspired, and is a perfect treasure of heavenly instruction;¹ that it has God for its author, salvation for its end,² and truth without any mixture of error for its matter;³ that it reveals the principles by which God will judge us;⁴ and therefore is, and shall remain to the end of the world, the true center of Christian union,⁵ and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds, and opinions should be tried.⁶ Places in

the Bible where taught

2 Timothy 3:16-17; 2 Peter 1:21; 1 Samuel 23:2; Acts 1:16; Acts 3:21; John 10:35; Luke 16:29-31; Psalms 119:11; Romans 3:1-2.

2 Timothy 3:15; 1 Peter 1:10-12; Acts 11:14; Romans 1:16; Mark 16:16; John 5:38-39.

Proverbs 30:5-6; John 17:17; Revelation 22:18-19; Romans 3:4.

Romans 2:12; John 12:47-48; 1 Corinthians 4:3-4; Luke 10:10-16; Luke 12:47-48.

Php 3:16; Ephesians 4:3-6; Php 2:1-2; 1 Corinthians 1:10; 1 Peter 4:11.

1 John 4:1; Isaiah 8:20; 1 Thessalonians 5:21; 2 Corinthians 8:5; Acts 17:11; 1 John 4:6; Jude 1:3, Jude 1:5; Ephesians 6:17; Psalms 119:59-60; Php 1:9-11.

II. OF THE TRUE GOD

We believe that there is one, and only one, living and true God, an infinite, intelligent Spirit, whose name is JEHOVAH, the Maker and Supreme Ruler of Heaven and earth;⁷ inexpressibly glorious in holiness,⁸ and worthy of all possible honor, confidence, and love;⁹ that in the unity of the Godhead there are three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost;¹⁰ equal in every divine perfection,¹¹ and executing distinct and harmonious offices in the great work of redemption.¹² Places in the Bible where taught John 4:24; Psalms 147:5; Psalms 83:18; Hebrews 3:4; Romans 1:20; Jeremiah 10:10 Exodus 15:11; Isaiah 6:3; 1 Peter 1:15-16; Revelation 4:6-8 Mark 12:30; Revelation 4:11; Matthew 10:37; Jeremiah 2:12-13 Matthew 28:19; John 15:26; 1 Corinthians 12:4-6; 1 John 5:7 John 10:30; John 5:17; John 14:23; John 17:5, John 17:10; Acts 5:3-4; 1 Corinthians 2:10-11; Php 2:5-6 Ephesians 2:18; 2 Corinthians 13:14; Revelation 1:4-5 III. OF THE FALL OF MAN

We believe that man was created in holiness, under the law of his Maker;¹³ but by voluntary transgression fell from that holy and happy state;¹⁴ in consequence of which all mankind are now sinners,¹⁵ not by constraint, but choice;¹⁶ being by nature utterly void of that holiness required by the law of God, positively inclined to evil; and therefore under just condemnation to eternal ruin,¹⁷ without defense or excuse.¹⁸ Places in the Bible where taught Genesis 1:27, Genesis 1:31; Ecclesiastes 7:29; Acts 16:26; Genesis 2:16 Genesis 3:6-24; Romans 5:12 Romans 5:19; John 3:6; Psalms 51:5; Romans 5:15-19; Romans 8:7 Isaiah 53:6; Genesis 6:12; Romans 3:9-18 Ephesians 2:1-3; Romans 1:18, Romans 1:32; Romans 2:1-16; Galatians 3:10; Matthew 20:15 Ezekiel 18:19-20; Romans 1:20; Romans 3:19; Galatians 3:22 IV. OF THE WAY OF SALVATION

We believe that the salvation of sinners is wholly of grace,¹⁹ through the mediatorial offices of the Son of God;²⁰ who by the appointment of the Father, freely took upon him our nature, yet without sin;²¹ honored the divine law by his personal obedience,²² and by his death made a full atonement for our sins;²³ that having risen from the death, he is now enthroned in heaven;²⁴ and uniting in his wonderful person the tenderest sympathies with divine perfections, he is every way qualified to be a suitable, a compassionate, and an all-sufficient Saviour.²⁵ Places in the Bible where taught Ephesians 2:5; Matthew 18:11; 1 John 4:10; 1 Corinthians 3:5-7; Acts 15:11 John 3:16; John 1:1-14; Hebrews 4:14; Hebrews 12:24 Php 2:6-7; Hebrews 2:9, Hebrews 2:14; 2 Corinthians 5:21 Isaiah 42:21; Php 2:8; Galatians 4:4-5; Romans 3:21

Isaiah 53:4-5; Matthew 20:28; Romans 4:25; Romans 3:21-26; 1 John 4:10; 1 John 2:2; 1 Corinthians 15:1-3; Hebrews 9:13-15 Hebrews 1:8, Hebrews 1:3; Hebrews 8:1; Colossians 3:1-4 Hebrews 7:25; Colossians 2:9; Hebrews 2:18; Hebrews 7:26; Psalms 89:19; Psalms 14:1-7 V. OF JUSTIFICATION

We believe that the great gospel blessing which Christ²⁶ secures to such as believe in him is Justification;²⁷ that Justification includes the pardon of sin,²⁸ and the promise of eternal life on principles of righteousness;²⁹ that it is bestowed, not in consideration of any works of righteousness which we have done, but solely through faith in the Redeemer's blood;³⁰ by virtue of which faith his perfect righteousness is freely imputed to us of God;³¹ that it brings us into a state of most blessed peace and favor with God, and secures every other blessing needful for time and eternity.³² Places in the Bible where taught John 1:16; Ephesians 3:8 Acts 13:39; Isaiah 3:11-12; Romans 8:1 Romans 5:9; Zechariah 13:1; Matthew 9:6; Acts 10:43 Romans 5:17; Titus 3:5-6; 1 Peter 3:7; 1 John 2:25; Romans 5:21 Romans 4:4-5; Romans 5:21; Php 3:7-9 Romans 5:19; Romans 3:24-26; Romans 4:23-25; 1 John 2:12 VI. OF THE FREENESS OF SALVATION

We believe that the blessings of salvation are made free to all by the gospel;³³ that it is the immediate duty of all to accept them by a cordial, penitent, and obedient faith;³⁴ and that nothing prevents the salvation of the greatest sinner on earth but his own inherent depravity and voluntary rejection of the gospel;³⁵ which rejection involves him in an aggravated condemnation.³⁶ Places in the Bible where taught Isaiah 55:1; Revelation 22:17; Luke 14:17 Romans 16:26; Mark 1:15; Romans 1:15-17 John 5:40; Matthew 23:37; Romans 9:32; Proverbs 1:24; Acts 13:46 John 3:19; Matthew 11:20; Luke 19:27; 2 Thessalonians 1:8 VII. OF GRACE IN REGENERATION

We believe that, in order to be saved, sinners must be regenerated, or born again;³⁷ that regeneration consists in giving a holy disposition to the mind;³⁸ that it is effected in a manner above our comprehension by the power of the Holy Spirit, in connection with divine truth,³⁹ so as to secure our voluntary obedience to the gospel;⁴⁰ and that its proper evidence appears in the holy fruits of repentance, and faith, and newness of life.⁴¹ Places in the Bible where taught John 3:3, John 3:6-7; 1 Corinthians 1:14; Revelation 8:7-9; Revelation 21:27 2 Corinthians 5:17; Ezekiel 36:26; Deuteronomy 30:6; Romans 2:28-29; Romans 5:5; 1 John 4:7 John 3:8; John 1:13; James 1:16-18; 1 Corinthians 1:30; Php 2:13 1 Peter 1:22-25; 1 John 5:1; Ephesians 4:20-24; Colossians 3:9-11 Ephesians 5:9; Romans 8:9; Galatians 5:16-23; Ephesians 3:14-21; Matthew 3:8-10; Matthew 7:20; 1 John 5:4, 1 John 5:18 VIII. OF REPENTANCE AND FAITH

We believe that Repentance and Faith are sacred duties, and also inseparable graces, wrought in our souls by the regenerating Spirit of God;⁴² whereby being deeply convinced of our guilt, danger, and helplessness, and of the way of salvation by Christ,⁴³ we turn to God with unfeigned contrition, confession, and supplication for mercy;⁴⁴ at the same time heartily receiving the Lord Jesus Christ as our Prophet, Priest, and King, and relying on him alone as the only and all-sufficient Saviour.⁴⁵ Places in the Bible where taught Mark 1:15; Acts 11:18; Ephesians 2:8; 1 John 5:1 John 16:8; Acts 2:37-38; Acts 16:30-31 Luke 18:13; Luke 15:18-21; James 4:7-10; 2 Corinthians 7:11; Romans 1:1-13; Psalms 51:1-19 Romans 10:9-11; Acts 3:22-23; Hebrews 4:14; Psalms 2:6; Hebrews 1:8; 2 Timothy 1:12 IX. OF GOD'S PURPOSE OF GRACE

We believe that Election is the eternal purpose of God, according to which he graciously regenerates, sanctifies, and saves sinners;⁴⁶ that being perfectly consistent with the free agency

of man, it comprehends all the means in connection with the end;⁴⁷ that it is a most glorious display of God's sovereign goodness, being infinitely free, wise, holy, and unchangeable;⁴⁸ that it utterly excludes boasting, and promotes humility, love, prayer, praise, trust in God, and active imitation of his free mercy;⁴⁹ that it encourages the use of means in the highest degree;⁵⁰ that it may be ascertained by its effects in all who truly believe the gospel;⁵¹ that it is the foundation of Christian assurance;⁵² and that to ascertain it with regard to ourselves demands and deserves the utmost diligence.⁵³ Places in the Bible where taught 2 Timothy 1:8-9; Ephesians 1:3-14; 1 Peter 1:1-2; Romans 11:5-6; John 15:15; 1 John 4:19; Hosea 12:9 2 Thessalonians 2:13-14; Acts 13:48; John 10:16; Matthew 20:16; Acts 15:14

Exodus 33:18-19; Matthew 20:15; Ephesians 1:11; Romans 9:23-24; Jeremiah 31:3; Romans 11:28-29; James 1:17-18; 2 Timothy 1:9; Romans 11:32-36

1 Corinthians 4:7; 1 Corinthians 1:26-31; Romans 3:27; Romans 4:16; Colossians 3:12; 1 Corinthians 3:5-7; 1 Corinthians 15:10; 1 Peter 5:10; Acts 1:24; 1 Thessalonians 2:13; 1 Peter 2:9; Luke 18:7; John 15:16; Ephesians 1:16; 1 Thessalonians 2:12 2 Timothy 2:10; 1 Corinthians 9:22; Romans 8:28-30; John 6:37-40; 2 Peter 1:10 1 Thessalonians 1:4-10 Romans 8:28-30; Isaiah 42:16; Romans 11:29 2 Peter 1:10-11; Php 3:12; Hebrews 6:11 X. OF SANCTIFICATION

We believe that Sanctification is the process by which, according to the will of God, we are made partakers of his holiness;⁵⁴ that it is a progressive work;⁵⁵ that it is begun in regeneration;⁵⁶ and that it is carried on in the hearts of believers by the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, the Sealer and Comforter, in the continual use of the appointed means-especially the Word of God, self-examination, self-denial, watchfulness, and prayer.⁵⁷ Places in the Bible where taught 1 Thessalonians 4:3; 1 Thessalonians 5:23; 2 Corinthians 7:1; 2 Corinthians 13:9; Ephesians 1:4 Proverbs 4:18; 2 Corinthians 3:18; Hebrews 6:1; 2 Peter 1:5-8; Php 3:12-16 John 2:2-9; Romans 8:5; John 3:6; Php 1:9-11; Ephesians 1:13-14

Php 2:12-13; Ephesians 4:11-12; 1 Peter 2:2; 2 Peter 3:18; 2 Corinthians 13:5; Luke 11:35; Luke 9:23; Matthew 26:41; Ephesians 6:18; Ephesians 4:30 XI. OF THE PERSEVERANCE OF SAINTS

We believe that such only are real believers as endure unto the end;⁵⁸ that their persevering attachment to Christ is the grand mark which distinguishes them from superficial professors;⁵⁹ that a special Providence watches over their welfare;⁶⁰ and they are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation.⁶¹ Places in the Bible where taught John 8:31; 1 John 2:27-28; 1 John 3:9; 1 John 5:18 1 John 2:19; John 13:18; Matthew 13:20-21; John 6:66-69; Job 17:9 Romans 8:28; Matthew 6:30-33; Jeremiah 32:40; Psalms 121:3; Psalms 91:11-12 Php 1:6; Php 2:12-13; Jude 1:24-25; Hebrews 1:14; 2 Kings 6:16; Hebrews 13:5; 1 John 4:4 XII. OF THE HARMONY OF THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL

We believe that the Law of God is the eternal and unchangeable rule of his moral government;⁶² that it is holy, just, and good;⁶³ and that the inability which the Scriptures ascribe to fallen men to fulfill its precepts arises entirely from their love of sin;⁶⁴ to deliver them from which, and to restore them through a Mediator to unfeigned obedience to the holy Law, is one great end of the Gospel, and of the means of grace connected with the establishment of the visible Church.⁶⁵ Places in the Bible where taught Romans 3:31; Matthew 5:17; Luke 16:17; Romans 3:20; Romans 4:15 Romans 7:12, Romans 7:4, Romans 7:14, Romans 7:22; Galatians 3:21; Psalms 119:1-176 Romans 8:7-8;

Joshua 24:19; Jeremiah 13:23; John 6:44; John 5:44

Romans 8:2, Romans 8:4; Romans 10:4; 1 Timothy 1:5; Hebrews 8:10; Jude 1:20-21; Hebrews 12:14; Matthew 16:17-18; 1 Corinthians 12:28 XIII. OF A GOSPEL CHURCH

We believe that a visible Church of Christ is a congregation of baptized believers,⁶⁶ associated by covenant in the faith and fellowship of the gospel;⁶⁷ observing the ordinances of Christ;⁶⁸ governed by his laws,⁶⁹ and exercising the gifts, rights, and privileges invested in them by his Word;⁷⁰ that its only scriptural officers are Bishops, or Pastors, and Deacons,⁷¹ whose qualifications, claims, and duties are defined in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus.

Places in the Bible where taught

1 Corinthians 1:1-13; Matthew 18:17; Acts 5:11; Acts 8:1; 1 Corinthians 4:17; 1 Corinthians 14:23; 3 John 1:9; 1 Timothy 3:5 Acts 2:41-42; 2 Corinthians 8:5; Acts 2:47; 1 Corinthians 5:12-13

1 Corinthians 11:2; 2 Thessalonians 3:6; Romans 16:17-20; 1 Corinthians 11:23; Matthew 18:15-20; 1 Corinthians 5:6; 2 Corinthians 2:7; 1 Corinthians 4:17

Matthew 28:20; John 14:15; John 15:12; 1 John 4:21; John 14:21; 1 Thessalonians 4:2; 2 John 1:6; Galatians 6:2; all the Epistles Ephesians 4:7; 1 Corinthians 14:12; Php 1:27; 1 Corinthians 12:14 Php 1:1; Acts 14:23; Acts 15:22; 1 Timothy 3:1-16; Titus 1:1-16 XIV. OF BAPTISM AND THE LORD'S SUPPER

We believe that Christian Baptism is the immersion in water of a believer,⁷² into the name of the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost;⁷³ to show forth, in a solemn and beautiful emblem, our faith in the crucified, buried, and risen Saviour, with its effect in our death to sin and resurrection to a new life;⁷⁴ that it is prerequisite to the privileges of a Church relation; and to the Lord's Supper,⁷⁵ in which the members of the Church, by the sacred use of bread and wine, are to commemorate together the dying love of Christ;⁷⁶ preceded always by solemn self-examination.⁷⁷ Places in the Bible where taught

Acts 8:36-39; Matthew 3:5-6; John 3:22-23; John 4:1-2; Matthew 28:19; Mark 16:16; Acts 2:38; Acts 8:12; Acts 16:32-34; Acts 18:8 Matthew 28:19; Acts 10:47-48; Galatians 3:27-28 Romans 6:4; Colossians 2:12; 1 Peter 3:20-21; Acts 22:16 Acts 2:41-42; Matthew 28:19-20; Acts and Epistles 1 Corinthians 11:26; Matthew 26:26-29; Mark 14:22-25; Luke 22:14-20 1 Corinthians 11:28; 1 Corinthians 5:1, 1 Corinthians 5:8; 1 Corinthians 10:3-32; 1 Corinthians 11:17-32; John 6:26-71 XV. OF THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH

We believe that the first day of the week is the Lord's Day, or Christian Sabbath;⁷⁸ and is to be kept sacred to religious purposes,⁷⁹ by abstaining from all secular labor and sinful recreations;⁸⁰ by the devout observance of all the means of grace, both private⁸¹ and public;⁸² and by preparation for that rest that remaineth for the people of God.⁸³ Places in the Bible where taught Acts 20:7; Genesis 2:3; Colossians 2:16-17; Mark 2:27; John 20:19; 1 Corinthians 16:1-2 Exodus 20:8; Revelation 1:10; Psalms 118:24 Isaiah 58:13-14; Isaiah 56:2-8

Psalms 119:15 Hebrews 10:24-25; Acts 11:26; Acts 13:44; Leviticus 19:30; Luke 4:16; Acts 17:2-3; Psalms 26:8; Psalms 87:3

Hebrews 4:3-11 XVI. OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT

We believe that civil government is of divine appointment, for the interests and good order of human society;⁸⁴ and that magistrates are to be prayed for, conscientiously honored and obeyed;⁸⁵ except only in things opposed to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ⁸⁶ who is the only Lord of the conscience, and the Prince of the kings of the earth.⁸⁷ Places in the Bible where taught Romans 13:1-7; Deuteronomy 16:18; 1 Samuel 23:3; Exodus 18:23; Jeremiah 1:1 Matthew 22:21; Titus 3:1; 1 Peter 2:13; 1 Timothy 2:1-8 Acts 5:29; Matthew 10:28; Daniel 3:15-18; Daniel 6:7-10; Acts 4:18-20 Matthew 23:10; Romans 14:4; Revelation 19:16; Psalms 72:11; Psalms 2:1-12; Romans 14:9-13 XVII. OF THE RIGHTEOUS AND THE WICKED

We believe that there is a radical and essential difference between the righteous and the wicked;⁸⁸ that such only as through faith are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and sanctified by the Spirit of our God, are truly righteous in his esteem;⁸⁹ while all such as continue in impenitence and unbelief are in his sight wicked, and under the curse;⁹⁰ and this distinction holds among men both in and after death.⁹¹ Places in the Bible where taught Malachi 3:18; Proverbs 12:26; Isaiah 5:20; Genesis 18:23; Jeremiah 15:19; Acts 10:34-35; Romans 6:16

Romans 1:17; Romans 7:6; 1 John 2:29; 1 John 3:7; Romans 6:18, Romans 6:22; 1 Corinthians 11:32; Proverbs 11:31; 1 Peter 4:17-18 1 John 5:19; Galatians 3:10; John 3:36; Isaiah 57:21; Psalms 10:4; Isaiah 55:6-7

Proverbs 14:32; Luke 16:25; John 8:21-24; Proverbs 10:24; Luke 12:4-5; Luke 9:23-26; John 12:25-26; Ecclesiastes 3:17; Matthew 7:13-14 XVIII. OF THE WORLD TO COME

We believe that the end of the world is approaching;⁹² that at the last day Christ will descend from heaven,⁹³ and raise the dead from the grave to final retribution;⁹⁴ that a solemn separation will then take place;⁹⁵ that the wicked will be adjudged to endless punishment, and the righteous to endless joy;⁹⁶ and that this judgment will fix forever the final state of men in heaven or hell, on principles of righteousness.⁹⁷ Places in the Bible where taught

1 Peter 4:7; 1 Corinthians 7:29-31; Hebrews 1:10-12; Matthew 24:35; 1 John 2:17; Matthew 28:20; Matthew 13:39-40; 2 Peter 3:3-13 Acts 1:11; Revelation 1:7; Hebrews 9:28; Acts 3:21; 1 Thessalonians 4:13-18; 1 Thessalonians 5:1-11

Acts 24:15; 1 Corinthians 15:12-58; Luke 14:14; Daniel 12:2; John 5:28-29; John 6:40; John 11:25-26; 2 Timothy 1:10; Acts 10:42 Matthew 13:49, Matthew 13:37-43; Matthew 24:30-31; Matthew 25:31-33

Matthew 25:35-41; Revelation 22:11; 1 Corinthians 6:9-10; Mark 9:43-48; 2 Peter 2:9; Jude 1:7; Php 3:19; 2 Corinthians 5:10-11; John 4:36; 2 Corinthians 4:18

Romans 3:5-6; 2 Thessalonians 1:6-12; Hebrews 6:1-2; 1 Corinthians 4:5; Acts 17:31; Romans 2:2-16; Revelation 20:11-12; 1 John 2:28; 1 John 4:17

01.04. Chapter 4

CHAPTER IV ORDINANCES OF A CHURCH This title is not used to convey the idea that a church has the right to institute ordinances. No such right exists. The Lord Jesus Christ is head of the church ? Lawgiver of the Gospel dispensation. He is the only Institutor of ordinances. Apostles had no discretion in the matter. They could only teach the baptized disciples "to observe all things" commanded by Christ. His will was to the, as to his followers, now the supreme law. It was optional with him to institute many ordinances or few. It was his pleasure to appoint only two, namely Baptism and the Lord's Supper. These appointments of Christ are church ordinances in the sense that they pertain to his churches ? not to the world; and are committed to the care of his churches, whom he holds responsible for their preservation in their original purity and integrity. There are some Baptists who hesitate to call baptism a church ordinance. They prefer to call it a "gospel ordinance" or a "ministerial ordinance." It is a gospel ordinance, and in one sense it is a ministerial ordinance. That is to say, it is administered by ministers of the gospel. But ministers derive their authority to preach and administer the ordinances from Christ, through his churches. Who recognizes the right of any man to preach or baptize, if unsustained by church authority? In this view of the matter baptism is evidently a church ordinance, and our Fathers in their Confession of 1689, refer to baptism and the Lord's Supper as Christ's ordinances "to be continued in his church to the end of the world."

I. BAPTISM In answer to the oft-repeated question, What is Baptism? it may be said, Baptism is the immersion in water, by a proper administrator, of a believer in Christ, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Immersion is so exclusively the subject of baptism, that without such a subject there is no baptism. In these two statements all Baptist will agree. As to proper administrator there may be some difference of opinion. By a proper administrator, in the foregoing definition, is meant a person who has received from a church authority to baptize. While the validity of an ordinance is not affected by every irregularity in its administration, it does seem incredible that baptism should be valid in the absence of the church authority referred to. What other authority is there? Will any one say, the authority of Christ? The supreme authority is undoubtedly his; but does he confer on men the right to baptize, through churches, or, independently of his churches? One of these views must be taken, and he who takes the latter will have to set aside the order of the gospel. But it does not comport with the plan of this little work to elaborate this point.

I. ACT OF BAPTISM. That immersion alone is the baptismal act may be shown by the following considerations:

(1) Greek Lexicons give immerse, dip, or plunge, as the primary and ordinary meaning of baptizo.

Here it is proper to state that baptizo and baptisma are, in the Common Version of the Scriptures, Anglicized, but not translated. By this it is only meant that their termination is made to correspond with the termination of English words. In baptizo the final letter is changed into e, and in baptisma the last letter is dropped altogether. To make this matter of Anglicism plain, it is only necessary to

say, that if *baptizo* had been subjected to the same treatment by King James' translators which *baptizo* received at their hands, we would have *baptize* in the New Testament, wherever we now have *sprinkle*. King James virtually forbade the translation of *baptize* and *baptism*. This has sometimes been denied, but it is susceptible of conclusive proof. The king's third instruction to his translators reads thus: "The old ecclesiastical words to be kept, as the word *church* not to be translated *congregation*." It is absurd to say that this rule had exclusive reference to the term "*church*"; for this term is manifestly given as a specimen of "old ecclesiastical words." And why should plurality of idea be conveyed by the phrase "ecclesiastical words," if the rule had respect to only one word? The question then is: Are *baptism* and *baptize* "old ecclesiastical words?" They were words when the Bible was translated, or they would not be found in it. They had been used by church historians, and by writers on ecclesiastical law, and were therefore ecclesiastical. They had been in use a long time, and were consequently old. They were "old ecclesiastical words." Such words the king commanded "to be kept" ? "not translated." It is worthy of remark too, that the Bishop of London, at the king's instance, wrote to the translators, reminding them that his majesty "wished his third and fourth rule to be specially observed." (Lewis' History of Translations, p. 319). This circumstance must have called special attention to the rule under consideration. In view of these facts it may surely be said, that the translators knew what were "old ecclesiastical words." Let their testimony then be adduced. In their "Preface to the Reader," they say they had "on the one side, avoided the scrupulosity of the Puritans, who left the old ecclesiastical words, and betook them to other, as when they put washing for baptism, and congregation for church; and on the other hand had shunned the obscurity of the Papists." Is not this enough? Here there is not only an admission that baptism was an old ecclesiastical word, but this admission is made by the translators themselves ? made most cheerfully ? for it was made in condemnation of the Puritans, and in commendation of themselves. The king's fourth rule was this: "When any word hath divers significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most eminent Fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place and the analogy of faith." *Baptizo* is not a word of divers significations; but if it was, the king's translators, if they had rendered it at all, would have been compelled by the fourth rule to render it *immerse*; for every man of ordinary intelligence knows it was "most commonly used" in this sense "by the most eminent Fathers." But it will be perceived that the king's third rule renders inoperative the fourth, so far as old ecclesiastical words are concerned. Whether such words have one meaning or a thousand meanings, they are "to be kept" ? "not translated." The translators were not at liberty to refer to the signification immemorially attached by the Greeks to *baptizo* ? a signification which received the cordial endorsement of "the most eminent Fathers." They might have examined the endorsement if the royal decree had not said, "hitherto, but no farther," "the old ecclesiastical words to be kept."

Some Baptist authors have expressed themselves as if King James had a special antipathy to immersion, and forbade the translation of *baptizo* and *baptism* with a view to encourage sprinkling, which had been introduced from Geneva into Scotland in the reign of Elizabeth, and was in the early part of the seventeenth century making its way into England. There is no historical evidence that the king was opposed to immersion; but he was bitterly opposed to the "Genevan Version" of the Bible, in which baptism was rendering washing. Most probably his dislike of this version led him to give his third rule. The Genevan Version was made by exiles from Scotland, who, during the reign of "Bloody Mary," fled to Geneva and became acquainted with John Calvin. The fact that *baptizo* is an Anglicized, and not a translated word, makes an appeal to Greek lexicons necessary

in ascertaining its meaning. Lexicons do not constitute the ultimate authority, but their testimony is valuable. There is a remarkable unanimity among them in representing immerse or its equivalent as the primary and ordinary meaning of the word. On this point Professor Stuart (long distinguished as the glory of the Andover Theological Seminary, Mass.) shall speak. in his treatise on the "Mode of Baptism," p. 14, he says, "Bapto and baptizo mean to dip, plunge, or immerge, into anything liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this." This quotation is made to supersede the necessity of giving the meaning of baptizo as furnished by the large number of Greek lexicons. Professor Stuart's statements will be received.

(2) Distinguished Pedobaptist theologians concede that baptizo means to immerse.

John Calvin in his Institutes [Vol. III, p. 491, edition of Presbyterian Board of Publication.] says: "But whether the person who is baptized be wholly immersed, and whether thrice or once, or whether water be only poured or sprinkled upon him, is of no importance; churches ought to be left at liberty, in this respect, to act according to the difference of countries. The very word baptize, however, signifies to immerse; and it is certain that immersion was the practice of the ancient church."

Dr. George Campbell, a distinguished Presbyterian of Scotland, in his "Notes" on Matthew 3:2, says: "The word baptizein" (infinitive mode, present tense, of baptizo) "both in sacred authors and in classical, signifies to dip, to plunge, to immerse, and was rendered by Tertullian, the oldest of the Latin Fathers, tingere, the term used for dyeing cloth, which was by immersion. It is always construed suitably to this meaning."

Doctor Chalmers, in his "Lectures on Romans" (Lecture XXX on Chap. VI, 3-7) says: "The original meaning of the word baptism is immersion, and though we regard it as a point of indifference, whether the ordinance so named be performed in this way or by sprinkling?yet we doubt not that the prevalent style of the administration in the apostles' days was by an actual submerging of the whole body under water. We advert to this for the purpose of throwing light on the analogy that is instituted in these verses. Jesus Christ, by death, underwent this sort of baptism?even immersion under the surface of the ground, whence he soon emerged again by his resurrection. We, by being baptized into his death, are conceived to have made a similar translation." This is a specimen of the concessions of learned Pedobaptists in regard to the meaning of baptizo. These concessions are of great value; for it may be said, in the language of another: "This testimony of theirs, to me, is worth a thousand others; seeing it comes from such as, in my opinion, are evidently interested to speak quite otherwise."

(3) The classical usage of baptizo establishes the position that immersion is the baptismal act.

It has been already stated that lexicons are not the ultimate authority in settling the meaning of words. Lexicographers are dependent on the sense in which words are used, to ascertain their meaning. But it is not impossible for them to mistake that sense. If they do, there is an appeal from their definitions to the *usus loquendi*, which is the ultimate authority. It is well to go back to the ultimate authority. Want of room forbids the insertion of extracts from classical Greek authors; but it will be sufficient to refer to the treatise of Professor Stuart on the "Mode of Baptism." The reader will see that the learned professor in proving that baptizo means immerse, gives the word as used by Pindar, Heraclides Ponticus, Plutarch, Lucian, Hippocrates, Strabo, Josephus, etc. Doctor

Conant has investigated the meaning of baptizo more exhaustively than any man, living or dead. No use is made of his work, because Pedobaptist testimony is preferred. Seven hundred years intervened between the birth of Pindar and the death of Lucian. During those seven centuries usage shows that baptizo meant to immerse. Most of the classic Greek writers lived before baptism was instituted, and consequently knew nothing of immersion as a religious ordinance. Those who lived after its institution cared nothing for it. There was no controversy as to the meaning of baptizo, during the classic period of Grecian history. There was no motive, therefore, that could so operate on Greek writers as to induce them to use the word in any but its authorized meaning. That meaning was most obviously to immerse.

It is said by some that though baptizo in classic Greek means immerse, it has a different meaning in the New Testament. Let them prove it. On them is the burden of proof, and they will find it a burden they cannot manage. Let every man who takes this view answer this question: Could the New Testament writers, as honest men, use baptizo in a new sense without notifying their readers of the fact? It is certain they could not, and equally certain that no such notification was given.

(4) The design of baptism furnishes a conclusive argument in favor of immersion.

There is in baptism a representation of the burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Paul says: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized in his death? Therefore we were buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection" (Romans 6:3-5). "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God who hath raised him from the dead" (Colossians 2:12). Peter says: "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ" (1 Peter 3:21).

It is clear from these passages that baptism has a commemorative reference to the burial and resurrection of Christ. The two ordinances of the gospel symbolically proclaim the three great facts of the gospel. These facts, as Paul teaches (1 Corinthians 14:3-4), are that Christ died, was buried, and rose again. The Lord's Supper commemorates the first fact. At his table the disciples of Christ are solemnly reminded that their Redeemer submitted to the agonies of death. They weep over him as crucified & dead. In baptism they see him buried and raised again, just as they see him dead in the sacred Supper. Baptism is, therefore, a symbolic proclamation of two of the three prominent facts of the gospel & the burial and resurrection of Christ.

Baptism also expresses, in emblem, the believer's death to sin, and resurrection to newness of life. In "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," there is a spiritual death to sin, and a spiritual resurrection to newness of life. These two facts are emblematically set forth in baptism. Hence the absurdity of baptizing any who are not dead to sin. We are baptized into the death of Christ. We profess our reliance on his death for salvation, and we profess, also, that as he died for sin, we have died to sin. As burial is a palpable separation of the dead from the living, so baptism is a symbolic separation of those dead to sin from those living in sin. And as a resurrection from the dead indicates an entrance into a new sphere of existence, so baptism in its similitude to a resurrection denotes an entrance upon a new life. Hence Doctor Chalmers in the

lecture already referred to says, that we "are conceived in the act of descending under the water of baptism, to have resigned an old life, and in the act of ascending, to emerge into a second or new life."

Baptism is likewise a symbol of purification. We read of the "washing of regeneration" and of having "our bodies washed with pure water." These forms of expression were most probably used to indicate the defiling nature of sin, from which we are really cleansed in the blood of Christ. Then baptism is the outward symbol of the inward washing. If any one should say the passages referred to will not bear this interpretation, be it so; but there is one passage that will bear it. "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord," said Ananias to Saul of Tarsus. "Wash away they sins." How? Literally? No, but symbolically. The blood of Jesus really washes away sins. Hence the language? "and washed us from our sins in his own blood." But the sins which the blood of Jesus has really washed away are symbolically and formally washed away in baptism.

Once more: Baptism anticipates the believer's resurrection from the dead. This we learn from 1 Corinthians 15:29: "Else what shall they do, who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?" These questions are proposed in the midst of an argument on the resurrection of the dead. Some of the Corinthians, it seems, denied the doctrine of the resurrection, and yet it does not appear that they questioned the propriety of observance of the ordinance of baptism. Paul virtually tells them that baptism has an anticipative reference to the resurrection of the saints. It has this reference, because it has a commemorative reference to the resurrection of Christ. It anticipates because it commemorates. The reason is obvious. The resurrection of the Lord Jesus procures the resurrection of his followers and is an infallible pledge of it. The two resurrections are inseparable. Baptism, therefore, while it commemorates the resurrection of Christ, anticipates, of necessity, the resurrection of his followers.

Now, if these views of the design and symbolic import of baptism are correct, it follows inevitably that the immersion, in water, of a believer in Christ, is essential to baptism?so essential that there can be no baptism without it. If baptism represents the burial and resurrection of Christ, it must be immersion. If it sets forth in emblem the believer's death to sin and resurrection to a new life, it must be immersion. If it in symbol washes away the sins which Christ has really washed away in his blood, still it must be immersion. And if it anticipates the resurrection, nothing but immersion justifies the anticipation. We are "buried by baptism"?that is, by means of baptism. When the baptismal process takes place there is certainly a "burial." The two are inseparable; and therefore, where there is no burial there is no baptism.

It had been our purpose to present a fifth consideration in favor of immersion, suggested by the places selected for the administration of baptism, and the circumstances attending its administration, as referred to in the New Testament; but the limits prescribed to this volume positively forbid.

2. SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM. While the import of the word baptize indicates what is the baptismal act, it does not determine who are to be baptized. We must, therefore, look else where than to the meaning of the word to ascertain who are scriptural subjects of baptism. And where shall we look? To the commission given by Christ to his apostles; for this commission is the supreme authority for the administration of baptism. Apart from it there is no authority to baptize. The circumstances

connected with the giving of this commission were replete with interest. The Saviour had finished the work which he came down from heaven to accomplish. He had offered himself a sacrifice for sin. He had exhausted the cup of atoning sorrow. He had lain in the dark mansions of the grave. He had risen in triumph from the dead, and was about to ascend to the right hand of the Majesty on high. Invested with perfect mediatorial authority, he said to his apostles:

"All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matthew 28:18-20). "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark 16:15-16) "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should he preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem" (Luke 24:4-47).

Surely the language of this commission is plain. Matthew informs us that teaching, or making disciples (for the verb *matheteuo* which he uses means make disciples) is to precede baptism; Mark establishes the priority of faith to baptism; and Luke connects repentance and remission of sins with the execution of the commission. No man can, in obedience to this commission, baptize an unbeliever or an unconscious infant. The unbeliever is not a penitent disciple, and it is obviously impossible for the infant to repent and believe the gospel.

It may be laid down as a principle of common sense, which commends itself to every candid mind, that a commission to do a thing authorizes only the doing of the thing specified. The doing of all other things is virtually forbidden. There is a maxim of law, that the expression of one thing is the exclusion of another, [Footnote: *Expressio unius est exclusio alterius*]. It must necessarily be so; for otherwise there could be no definiteness in contracts, and no precision in legislative enactments or judicial decrees. This maxim may be illustrated in a thousand ways. Numerous scriptural illustrations are at hand. For example: God commanded Noah to make an ark of gopher-wood. He assigns no reason why gopher-wood should be used. The command however, is positive, and it forbids the use of every other kind of wood. Abraham was commanded to offer his son Isaac for a burnt offering. He was virtually forbidden to offer any other member of his family. Aye, more, he could not offer an animal till the order was revoked by Him who gave it, and a second order was given, requiring the sacrifice of a ram in the place of Isaac. The institution of the Passover furnishes an illustration, or rather a combination of illustrations: A lamb was to be killed ? not a heifer; it was to be of the first year ? not of the second or third; a male ? not a female; without a blemish ? not with a blemish; on the fourteenth day of the month ? not on some other day; the blood was to be applied to the door-posts and lintels ? not elsewhere. The Constitution of the United States supplies many illustrations, only two of which will be mentioned. It provides that "the President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the senators present concur." Does any sane man believe the Supreme Court and the House of Representatives can make treaties? Or that the President without the Senate, or the Senate without the President, can make treaties? The Constitution in giving the treaty-making power to the President and Senate virtually forbids all others to make treaties.

Again, the Constitution says: "The President, Vice-president, and all civil officers of the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for and conviction of treason, bribery, or

other high crimes and misdemeanors." Here one method of removal from office is prescribed, and all other methods are prohibited. Every man understands this. In application of the principle laid down and of the law maxim illustrated, it may be affirmed, that the commission of Christ, in enjoining the baptism of disciples, believers, prohibits, in effect, the baptism of all others. It will not do to say, we are not forbidden, in so many words, to baptize infants. The same may be said of unbelievers; aye, of horses, cattle, and bells.

It will be said by those who oppose the views of Baptists ? for it has been said a thousand times ? that if infants are not to be baptized because they cannot believe, they will not be saved, because they cannot believe. If the salvation of infants depends on their faith, they cannot be saved. They are incapable of faith. They are doubtless saved through the mediation of Christ, but it is not by faith. Our opponents fail egregiously to accomplish their object in urging this objection to our views. They must intend to make us admit the propriety of infant baptism, or force us to a denial of infant salvation. But we make neither the admission nor the denial. As soon as we say that infants are saved, not by faith, but without faith, their objection is demolished. In considering the commission of Christ it is well to observe how it was understood and carried into effect in apostolic times. The first practical interpretation of it was given on the day of Pentecost. The gospel was preached, the people were pierced to the heart, and cried out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter replied, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you." No man will say that the command "Repent," is applicable to infants, and it is certain the same persons were called on to repent and be baptized. The result of Peter's sermon is seen in the following words: "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added to them about three thousand souls." The baptism was limited to those who gladly received Peter's words; and as infants were not of that number, to infer that they were baptized is utterly gratuitous. The Pentecostal administration of baptism shows that penitent believers were considered the only subjects of the ordinance.

Philip's labors in Samaria indicate his understanding of the Great Commission. He preached Christ to the people. What then? The people "believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ." What next? "They were baptized, both men and women." Here again baptism was restricted to believers. Was this rule deviated from among the Gentiles? Certainly not. When Peter preached to Cornelius and his dependents, there was a restriction of baptism to those who received the Holy Spirit; and when Paul preached in Corinth "many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized."

Thus it appears that among Gentiles, as well as Samaritans and Jews, baptism was preceded by faith in Christ. Thus does it appear that the commission was practically expounded in the same way both in Europe and Asia. Nor do the household baptisms mentioned in the New Testament furnish any argument against the baptism of believers alone: for something is said of every household which could not be said of unconscious infants. For example, it is said of Cornelius (Acts 2:2), that he "feared God with all his house; of the jailer (Acts 16:32, Acts 16:34) that Paul and Silas "spake to him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house," and that he "rejoiced, believing in God with all his house." It is said of Lydia (Acts 16:40) that Paul and Silas having been released from prison, entered into her house, "and when they had seen the brethren, they comforted them." Doubtless "the brethren" were persons in Lydia's employ who constituted her "household," and were baptized as well as herself. Infants would not have been called

brethren, nor referred to as comforted. The intimation in Acts 18:8 is that the family of Crispus was baptized, but it is said he "believed on the Lord with all his house." Paul, as we learn from 1 Corinthians 1:16, baptized the household of Stephanas, but he says in the same epistle (1 Corinthians 16:15): "Ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the first fruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints." These are all the household baptisms mentioned in the New Testament, and we see in them no deviation from the commission of Christ which requires discipleship as prerequisite to baptism. On the other hand, they confirm the position, that believers alone are scriptural subjects of baptism. The allusions to baptism in the apostolic epistles forbid the supposition that infants were baptized. Paul refers to the "baptized" as "dead to sin" ? rising from the baptismal waters to "walk in newness of life" ? as "putting on Christ" ? as "baptized for the dead," or in the belief of the resurrection. Peter defines baptism to be "the answer of a good conscience toward God." This is a general definition which precludes the idea that baptism was, in apostolic times, administered to any except accountable agents. What conscience has a speechless infant? There is no operation of conscience prior to accountability. Baptism, then, in its administration to infants, cannot be what Peter says it is.

Without enlarging on these topics, what is the conclusion of the whole matter? Clearly this: The commission of Christ, as understood and exemplified in the apostolic age, requires the baptism of believers, disciples; and the baptism of all others, whether adult unbelievers or unconscious infants, is utterly unwarranted. There is, as Paul has said, ONE BAPTISM. It is one in the action involved, and one in the subject of the action.

II. THE LORD'S SUPPER

What Paul says of the institution and design of the Lord's Supper is the substance of what the evangelists had recorded. These are his words: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered to you. That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: and when he has given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup when he had supped, saying, This is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come" (1 Corinthians 11:23-26). From this inspired account of the origin of the Lord's Supper it is plainly a commemorative institution. It commemorates chiefly and supremely the death of Christ. "Ye do show the Lord's death." We do not show the birth, or baptism, or burial, or resurrection, or ascension of our Redeemer, but his death. If ever the tragedy of Calvary should engross the thoughts of the Christian to the exclusion of every other topic, it is when he sits at the table of the Lord. Then the death of his Lord should monopolize all the power of memory.

Remember thee! thy death, they shame! The griefs which thou didst bear!

O memory, leave no other name But his recorded there.

Some will perhaps say, that in the Lord's Supper we express our Christian fellowship for our fellow communicants. This is done only in an indirect and incidental manner. Our communion, according to Paul, is the communion of the body and blood of Christ. It is a solemn celebration of his atoning death.

Baptists, with comparatively few exceptions, have ever considered baptism a prerequisite to the Lord's table. They have so regarded it, because they have recognized its indispensableness to church-membership. They have reasoned in this way: The Lord's Supper is an ordinance to be observed exclusively by the members of a visible church of Christ. As the Lord's Supper is a church ordinance it is not proper to administer it to persons in their individual capacity—for example, to the sick at their homes. The meeting of a church is indispensable to a scriptural observance of the solemn feast. None can be members of a visible church of Christ without baptism. Therefore, baptism is a prerequisite to communion at the Lord's table. It will be seen from this statement of the case, that baptism is a prerequisite to the Lord's Supper because it is a prerequisite to church-membership. Church-membership is the chief condition anterior to communion at the Lord's table. Baptism is a condition precedent only in the sense that it precedes, and is essential to church-membership. It would be well for Baptists to make this view more prominent. Let them not say less of baptism, but more of church-membership. In Acts 2:41 it is said: "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added to them about three thousand souls." The three thousand were no doubt added to the church, "the hundred and twenty disciples," mentioned in the preceding chapter; for in the last verse of the second chapter it is written: "And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved." The adding in the two verses was the same in kind—that is, it was an adding to the church. It will be perceived that the baptized were added to the church, and that this was done before the "breaking of bread"—a phrase descriptive of the Lord's Supper. A refusal on the part of Baptists to commune with Pedobaptists grows out of the fact that the latter have ever been considered by the former as unbaptized, and consequently without a scriptural church-membership.

Even the celebrated Robert Hall, who advocated the intercommunion of Baptist and Pedobaptists, with an eloquence and energy of argumentation rarely to be found in the annals of controversy, does not hesitate to express the opinion that Pedobaptists are unbaptized. He says:

"We certainly make no scruple of informing a Pedobaptist candidate that we consider him as unbaptized, and disdain all concealment upon the subject." Again, "If we join with those whom we are obliged to consider as unbaptized, they unite with persons who, in their judgment, repeat an ordinance which ought not to be performed but once, nullify a Christian institute and deprive their children of the benefit of a salutary rite." (Hall's Works. Vol.I, pp.455,456) But while Mr. Hall considered Pedobaptists unbaptized, he insisted on their right as unbaptized persons to come to the Lord's table. He did not admit baptism to be a prerequisite to communion. Had he conceded this, a point almost universally conceded by Baptists and Pedobaptists, he would not have written his "Terms of Communion" at all. To demolish all that Robert Hall ever wrote in favor of "Mixed Communion," it is only necessary to show the scriptural priority of baptism to the Lord's Supper. And surely this is not difficult to do. That baptism was first instituted, is a significant fact. No one will deny that John, the harbinger of Christ, baptized multitudes, and that Jesus through his disciples (John 4:1-2) baptized more than John, before the institution of the Lord's Supper. It is morally certain that those present at its institution, the night of the betrayal, had been baptized. Jesus himself had been baptized, and it is too much for credulity itself to believe that he selected unbaptized persons as his apostles. Does the subsequence of the Lord's Supper, in its original appointment, to baptism, mean nothing? But it was said by Mr. Hall, that "John's baptism was not

Christian. It was gospel baptism. It was not an ordinance of the Mosaic economy. John certainly introduced the gospel dispensation. His preaching was "the beginning of the gospel" (Mark 1:1) and "the law and the prophets were until John" (Luke 16:16). If any one chooses to deny that his baptism was Christian because it is not so termed, the denial may be so enlarged as to embrace all the baptisms of the New Testament; for the epithet Christian is not applied to any of them. But while firmly believing that John's was a gospel ministry and a gospel baptism, all this might be waived by Baptists, for argument's sake, and then they can show the unavoidable priority of baptism to communion. Let them go at once to Christ's last commission: "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them." Every scholar knows the Greek term translated "teach" means disciple, or make disciples. Disciples to Christ were to be made through the preaching and teaching of the apostles. This is plain. The discipling process was first, and then the baptismal act was to be performed. "Go, disciple all nations, baptizing them." Now, according to the commission, it is evident that the process of discipleship is to be so immediately followed by the administration of baptism, as to leave no room for an observance of the Lord's Supper to intervene. Baptism is the first thing after a person is disciplined to Christ. It is the believer's first public duty. It is the first external manifestation of his internal piety. It is an open avowal of allegiance to Christ. It is, therefore, inevitably prior to the Lord's Supper, and observance of which is no doubt included in the expression: "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." The baptized disciples are to be taught to observe all things which he has commanded. Under the commission of Christ his ministers are not required to say anything about the Lord's Supper to the unbaptized. The baptized disciples are to be instructed. How then can the Lord's Supper precede baptism, when the commission enjoins the mention of it only to the baptized? But how did the apostles understand and carry into effect this commission? This is a question of capital importance in this discussion. On the day of Pentecost, Peter said to the convicted Jews, "Repent, and be baptized." The baptism was to succeed the repentance. There is no intimation that the Lord's Supper was to come between. And it is added, that the baptized "continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." The breaking of bread—the Lord's Supper—was preceded by baptism. When Philip went down to Samaria and preached, the people believed, and "were baptized, both men and women." The narrative plainly indicated that baptism, and not the Lord's Supper, immediately followed the people's belief of what Philip preached. When the Ethiopian eunuch avowed his faith in Christ, Philip at once baptized him. There was no celebration of the Lord's Supper before they left the chariot and "went down into the water." When Cornelius and his house received the Holy Spirit, Peter did not ask who can forbid the Lord's table to them, but, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized?" When Paul and Silas, at the hour of midnight, preached to the jailer and his family, and they believed, what was then done? Did they commune at the Lord's table? No, but he and all his were baptized immediately.

Thus does it appear that the apostles and primitive ministers understood the commission as enjoining baptism before the Lord's Supper. They have left an instructive example, which we are not at liberty to disregard. In view of this example we may boldly affirm that the whole tenor of the New Testament indicated the priority of baptism to communion. Nothing is plainer.

Pedobaptists concede the precedence of baptism to the Lord's Supper. Doctor Wall, in his "History of Infant Baptism," Part 11, Chap. IX, expresses himself in strong terms as follows:

?No church ever gave the communion to any persons before they were baptized. Among all the absurdities that ever were held, none ever maintained that any persons should partake of the communion before they were baptized.?

Doctor Doddridge, in his ?Miscellaneous Works,? p. 510, remarks:

?It is certain that Christians in general have always been spoken of, by the most ancient Fathers, as baptized persons. And it is also certain that, as far as our knowledge of primitive antiquity extends, no unbaptized person received the Lord?s Supper.?

Doctor Hibbard, a Methodist author of considerable distinction, in his work on ?Christian Baptism,? thus expresses himself:

?It is but just to remark, that in one principle the Baptist and the Pedobaptist churches agree. They both agree in rejecting from communion at the table of the Lord, and in denying the rights of church fellowship to all who have not been baptized. Valid baptism they consider as essential to constitute visible church-membership. This, also, we hold. The only question then that here divides us is, what is essential to valid baptism? The Baptists, in passing a sweeping sentence of disfranchisement upon all other Christian churches, have only acted upon a principle held in common with all other churches, viz.: that baptism is essential to church-membership... Of course, they must be their own judges as to what baptism is. It is evident, they can never reciprocate the courtesy; and the charge of close communion is no more applicable to the Baptists than to us; inasmuch as the question of church-membership is determined by as liberal principles as it is with any other Protestant churches?so far, I mean, as the present subject is concerned, i.e., it is determined by valid baptism.? (Hibbard's ?Christian Baptism,? pp. 171,175.) This extract from Doctor Hibbard exhibits a spirit of controversial candor and fairness, not often witnessed in the discussion of the communion question. It explodes the charge of ?Baptist bigotry and exclusiveness,? and establishes the fact that the point in dispute between Baptists and others is not about close communion, but close baptism. The controversy is supremely and intensely baptismal.

Every visible church of Christ may be considered a sacred enclosure, susceptible of entrance in but one way. In that enclosure is set the table of the Lord. And the Lord of the table has prescribed the terms of admittance into that enclosure. Those who have complied with the terms and have entered in, are the guardians of the table. They must see to it that it is approached only in the way which the Lord of the enclosure and of the table has specified. If they are appealed to, to change the entrance way, or to make a new entrance, or to allow those without to make ways of entrance to suit themselves, they must say with strongest emphases: ?THERE IS ONE LAWGIVER? ? ?WE HAVE NO SUCH CUSTOM, NEITHER THE CHURCHES OF GOD.?

It will be said, for it has been said, no one knows how often?the table is the Lord?s. This all will concede. But how different are the reasonings based on this concession! Pedobaptists say, as it is the Lord's table they have a right to approach it?that as it is not the table of the Baptists, the Baptists ought not to place obstructions in the way of their approach. Baptists say, as it is the Lord?s table, it must be approached in the way he directs?that his proprietorship of the table furnishes the reason of their course?that if it was their table they would have discretionary authority, whereas they now have none?that they do not place obstructions in the way of

Pedobaptist, but that the Lord of the table has done it. This is a specimen of the logic employed by the two parties in the controversy. Which species of logic indicated greater loyalty to Christ, the reader may determine.

01.05. Chapter 5

CHAPTER V THE GOVERNMENT OF A CHURCH There are three forms of church government, indicated by the terms Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, and Congregationalism.

Episcopacy recognizes the right of bishops to preside over districts of country, and one of its fundamental doctrines is, that a bishop is officially superior to other ministers. Of course, a modern bishop has under his charge the "inferior clergy"; for it is insisted, that the "ordaining power," and "the right to rule," belong to the Episcopal office. Those who adopt the Episcopal form of government believe that there are three orders in the ministry — namely, deacons, elders, and bishops. The modern application of the term bishop to a man who has under his charge a district of country, is very objectionable. It has almost banished from Christendom the idea originally attached to the term. In apostolic times bishop, pastor, and elder were terms of too equivalent import. The elders of the church of Ephesus are termed (Acts 20:24) overseers — in the original, episcopos — the word generally translated "bishop," if indeed "bishop" may be called a translation.

Presbyterianism recognizes two classes of elders — preaching elders and ruling elders. The pastor and ruling elders of a congregation constitute what is called the "session of the church." The "session" transacts the business of the church, receives, dismisses, excludes members, etc. From the decisions of a session there is an appeal to the presbytery; from the action of the presbytery an appeal to the Synod; and from the action of the Synod an appeal to the General Assembly, whose adjudications are final and irresistible.

Congregationalism antagonizes with Episcopacy and Presbyterianism, and distinctly recognizes these truths:

1. That the governmental power is in the hands of the people.

It resides with the people in contradistinction from bishops or elders — that is to say, bishops or elders can do nothing, strictly and properly ecclesiastic, without the concurrence of the people.

2. The right of a majority of the members of a church to rule, in accordance with the law of Christ. The will of the majority having been expressed, it becomes the minority to submit.

3. That the power of a church cannot be transferred or alienated, and that church action is final. The power of a church cannot be delegated. There may be messengers of a church, but there cannot be delegates in the ordinary sense of the term. It would be well for the churches in their letters to associations and councils, to say messengers, not delegates. No church can empower any man, or body of men, to do anything which will impair its independency [sic].

These are highly important principles, and while the existence of the congregational form of church government depends on their recognition and application, it is an inquiry of vital moment: Does the New Testament inculcate these principles? For if it does not, whatever may be said in commendation of them, they possess no obligatory force. Does the New Testament then inculcate the foundation principle of Congregationalism; namely, that the governmental power of a church is

with the member? Let us see.

It was the province of the apostolic churches to admit members into their communion. In Romans 14:1 it is written: "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye." The import of this language obviously is, "Receive into your fellowship and treat as a Christian him who is weak in faith." There is unquestionably a command "RECEIVE YE." To whom is this command addressed? To bishops? It is not. To the "Sessions of the church," composed of the pastor and the ruling elders? No. To whom then? To the very persons to whom the epistle was addressed, and it was written "to all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints." No ingenuity can torture this language into a command given to the officers of the church in Rome. The members of the church, whose designation was "saints," were addressed and commanded to "receive the weak in faith." It was their business to decide who should be admitted into their Christian community; and Paul under the impulses of inspiration, says, "Him that is weak in the faith, receive ye."

We now proceed to show that the New Testament churches had the right to exclude unworthy members, and that they exercised the right. In 1 Corinthians 5:1-5 we read as follows "It is reported commonly that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles, that one should have his father's wife. And ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you. For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed; in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one to Satan, for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus."

It is worthy of remark that while Paul "judged" that the incestuous man ought to be excluded from the church, he did not exclude him. He did not claim the right to do so; and when he said to the "churches of Galatia," "I would they were even cut off who trouble you," he did not cut them off, though he desired that it should be done.

It deserves notice too, that the members of the Corinthian church could not, in their individual capacity, exclude the incestuous man. It was necessary that they should be "gathered together." they must assemble as a church. Thus assembling "the power of our Lord Jesus Christ" was to be with them. They were to act by his authority, and execute his will; for he makes it incumbent on his churches to exercise discipline. In the last verse of the chapter referred to, Paul says: "Put away from among yourselves that wicked person." Here is a command, given by an inspired man, requiring the exclusion of an unworthy member from the church at Corinth. To whom was the command addressed? To the official members of the church? No; but "to the church of God, which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints." The right of a church to exclude from its communion disorderly persons is recognized in 2 Thessalonians 3:6 : "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly." This command was addressed "to the church of the Thessalonians." To withdraw from a "disorderly brother" is the same thing as to exclude him. There is a cessation of church fellowship.

Matthew 18:17 has not been referred to because it will be noticed in another place. The reader will see, upon examination, that the passage clearly implies the power of "the church" to perform the act of excommunication, by which the member cut off becomes "as a heathen man and a

publican.? The apostolic churches had the power and the right to restore excluded members who gave satisfactory evidence of penitence. In 2 Corinthians 2:6-8 the incestuous man is again mentioned, as follows: ?Sufficient to such a man is this punishment, which was inflicted of many. So that contrariwise ye ought rather to forgive him and comfort him, lest perhaps such an one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow. Wherefore I beseech you that ye would confirm your love toward him.? The apostle manages this case with the greatest tenderness and delicacy. He refers to the excluded member without the least reference to the disgraceful offense for which he was excluded. ?Sufficient,? says he, ?is this punishment,? etc. That is, the object of the exclusion had been accomplished. The church had shown its determination not to connive at sin, and the excluded member had become penitent. But the point under consideration is, that the apostle advised the restoration of the penitent offender. Paul could no more restore him to the church than he could expel him from it in the first instance; but he says, ?I beseech you that ye confirm your love toward him.? The power to restore was with the church, and Paul solicits an exercise of that power. The great apostle in saying. ?I beseech you,? bows to the majesty of democratic church sovereignty. He virtually admits that nothing could be done unless the church chose to act.

Now, if the New Testament churches had the power and the right to receive, exclude, and restore members, they must have had the right to transact any other business coming before them. There surely can be nothing more vital to the interests of a church than the reception, exclusion, and restoration of members. Here we might let the argument for the foundation principle of congregationalism rest; but there is other proof of the recognition of that principle. In Acts 1:1-26 there is an account of the election of Matthias to the apostleship. He was to succeed Judas, the traitor. The most natural inference is, that Matthias was chosen by the ?one hundred and twenty disciples? mentioned in Acts 1:15. These disciples were, no doubt, the church to which the three thousand converts were added on the day of Pentecost. The people must have been held in high estimation by Peter, if called on in conjunction with the apostles themselves to elect a successor to Judas. In Acts 5:1-42 there is reference to the circumstances which originated the deacon?s office, and also to the manner in which the first deacons were appointed. It will be seen that the matter of grievance was referred by the apostles to the multitude of the disciples--that they directed the brethren to look out seven men--and they chose, etc. The words we have italicized render the agency of the people in the whole transaction clear as the sun in heaven. Not only the disciples, but the multitude, the whole multitude of the disciples acted. No language could more strongly express the action of a church, as distinguished from that of its officers. In support of the fundamental principle of Congregationalism, the following facts are stated: The ?whole church?--the ?brethren?--are names in connection with the ?apostles and elders? Acts 15:22-23 : ?Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole church, to send chosen men... And they wrote letters by them after this manner: ?The apostles, and elders, and brethren, send greeting.?? The brethren of the church at Jerusalem acted, as well as the apostles and elders. The churches of apostolic times sent forth ministers on missionary tours. When Antioch received the word of God, the church at Jerusalem ?sent forth Barnabas, that he should go as far as Antioch? (Acts 2:22). His labors were successful--?much people was added to the Lord?--and at a subsequent period the church in Antioch sent out Saul and Barnabas, who made a long journey, performed much labor, returned, and reported to the church all that God had done with them . (Acts 13:1-3; Acts 14:26-27) With what deferential respect did these ministers of the gospel treat the church that

sent them forth! The apostles, so far from exercising lordship over the churches, did not control their charities. This is seen in Acts 11:29-30; 1 Corinthians 16:1-2; 2 Corinthians 9:7. The churches selected messengers to convey their charities. (See 1 Corinthians 16:3; 2 Corinthians 8:18-19; Php 2:25; Php 4:18.) A second principle of Congregationalism, already announced, is the right of a majority of the members of a church to rule in accordance with the law of Christ. In 2 Corinthians 2:6 it is written, "Sufficient to such a man is this punishment, which was inflicted of many." A literal translation of the words rendered "of many," would be "by the more"-that is, by the majority. McKnight's translation is, "by the governmental power of a church is with the members, it follows that a majority must rule. This is so plain a principle of Congregationalism, and of common sense, that it is needless to dwell upon it. A third truth, recognized by the Congregational form of church government is, that the power of a church cannot be transferred or alienated, and that church action is final. The church at Corinth could not transfer her power to the church at Philippi, nor could the church at Antioch convey her authority to the church of Ephesus. Neither could all the apostolic churches combined delegate their power to an association, or synod, or convention. That church power is inalienable results from the foundation principle of Congregationalism-that this power is in the hands of the people, the membership. And if the power of a church cannot be transferred, church action is final. That there is no tribunal higher than a church is evident from Matthew 18:15-17. The Saviour lays down a rule for the adjustment of private differences among brethren. "If thy brother shall trespass against thee go tell him his fault." etc. If the offender, when told of his fault, does not give satisfaction, the offended party is to take with him, "one or two or more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established." But if the offender "shall neglect to hear them," what is to be done? "Tell it to the church." What church? Evidently the particular congregation to which the parties belong. If the offender does not hear the church, what then? "Let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." But can there be no appeal to an association, or presbytery, or conference? No. There is no appeal. Shall an association, or presbytery, or conference put the offender back in church fellowship, when the church, by its action, classed him with heathens and publicans? This is too preposterous. What kind of fellowship would it be? Will it be asked, what is to be done if the action of a church does not give satisfaction to all concerned? What is to be done when the action of a Presbyterian General Assembly, or Methodist General Conference, or an Episcopal General Convention does not give satisfaction? There must be a stopping-place. There must be final action. Baptists says [sic], with the New Testament before them, that the action of each local congregation of believers is final. Pedobaptists, with the exception of Independents and Congregationalists, deny the finality of church action. Who are right? Let those who oppose the Baptist form of church government show in the New Testament the remotest allusion to an appeal from the decision of a church to any other tribunal. It cannot be done. The view here presented of the independence of the apostolic churches is so obviously in accordance with the facts of the case that distinguished Pedobaptists have been forced to concede it. Hence Mosheim, a Lutheran, and a bitter enemy of Baptists, speaking of the first century, says: "The churches in those early times were entirely independent, none of them being subject to any foreign jurisdiction, but each governed by its own rulers and its own laws; for, though the churches founded by the apostles had this particular deference shown to them, that they were consulted in difficult and doubtful cases, yet they had no juridical authority, no sort of supremacy over the others nor the least right to enact laws for them." (Maclaine's "Mosheim's Church History," Baltimore edition, Vol. I, p. 39.)

Archbishop Whately, a dignitary of the Church of England, referring to the apostolic churches, says: "They were each a distinct, independent community on earth, united by the common principles on which they were founded, and by their mutual agreement, affection and respect; but not having any one recognized Head on earth, or acknowledging any sovereignty of one of these societies over others." Again: "A CHURCH and a DIOCESE seem to have been for a considerable time coextensive and identical. And each church or diocese, though connected with the rest by ties of faith, and hope, and charity, seems to have been perfectly independent as far as regards any power of control." ("Kingdom of Christ," Carter's edition, pp. 36, 44.) This is strong testimony from a Lutheran and an Episcopalian. They would have given a different representation of the matter, if they could have done so consistently with truth. They virtually condemned their own denominational organizations in writing thus.

Before closing this chapter, it may be proper to say that while a church in the exercise of its independence may receive members excluded from another church, it cannot be done, in ordinary circumstances, without a violation of church courtesy, and a departure from the spirit of the gospel. It is assumed that, as a general thing, members are deservedly excluded from church fellowship. When this is the case, it is manifestly improper for them to be received by sister churches. It would have been a flagrant violation of propriety for any other church to have received to its membership the incestuous man expelled by the church at Corinth. Those justly excluded, if they would enjoy church privileges again, must penitently confess the offenses for which they were excluded, and obtain restoration to membership in the church from whose fellowship they were cut off. This is the general rule. Sometimes, however, a member is unjustly excluded. Prejudice or party feeling may control the action of the church. In the exercise of discipline the law of Christ may be departed from. Acknowledgments which ought to be satisfactory may be declared insufficient. The arraigned member is unjustly expelled. The impression, it may be, is made on the community, as well as on sister churches, that the expulsion is unjust. What is to be done? The excluded member is suffering wrongfully, and earnestly desires to enjoy church privileges. The church that has passed the excluding act ought to rescind it. Suppose, however, the church, disregarding the advice of disinterested, judicious brethren, does not rescind its act. Then the expelled member, the injustice of his exclusion being known, may be rightfully received into the fellowship of another church. Such cases rarely occur; but when they do, it is well to know that they may be disposed of in the manner here suggested. There is in church independence ample authority for this course of procedure. **THE ACTS OF A CHURCH ARE VALID AND BINDING WHEN THEY ACCORD WITH THE LAW OF CHRIST: WHEN THEY DO NOT THEY ARE NULL AND VOID.**

01.06. Chapter 6

CHAPTER VI THE DISCIPLINE OF A CHURCH

If discipline is necessary in families, schools, and armies, it must answer important purposes in the churches of Christ. It may be considered the process by which the spiritual improvement, usefulness, and efficiency of a church are promoted. In its comprehensive sense church discipline is both formative and corrective, though the phrase is generally used in the latter acceptance. We notice briefly.

I. FORMATIVE DISCIPLINE The doctrine of formative discipline is taught in such passages as these: "In whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit." "For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." "Giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity." "Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Ephesians 2:21-22; Ephesians 4:12-13; 2 Peter 1:5-7; 2 Peter 3:18).

It is clear from these Scriptures that Christians should ever be in a state of progressive spiritual improvement. They must not retrograde, nor remain stationary, but be constantly advancing in the divine life. The "perfecting of the saints" is an object of vast importance. The perfection referred to has to do, not so much with absolute freedom from sin, as some suppose, as with the symmetrical development and maturity of Christian character. The new convert to the faith of the gospel is a "babe," a spiritual infant, that has "need of milk," and not of "strong meat." Formative church discipline contemplates the vigorous growth of the "babe in Christ" till it is developed into "a perfect man." Bringing the baptized disciples into local church organizations has this purpose in view. They are to be taught "to observe all things whatsoever Christ has commanded." By such observance alone can a church edify itself in love, building up its members on their most holy faith. By such observance is promoted the symmetry of Christian character, and in it are included all the activities of the Christian life.

Formative discipline, in its sanctifying influences, ought to reach every church-member. The old, with their gray hairs, should exhibit its beneficial power in the ripeness of the fruits of the Spirit. The middle-aged, in the perfection of physical strength, should also show that it makes them "strong in the Lord and in the power of his might." And the young, in the morning of life, should yield to its plastic touches, that they may become useful laborers in the vineyard of the Lord. All have been redeemed with the precious blood of Christ and "should live, not to themselves, but to him who dies and rose again."

If every church will experimentally and practically learn the lessons taught in 1 Corinthians 12:12-27, the subject of formative discipline will be well understood. Then no member will be dissatisfied with his own place, and envy the place of another. No one will attach undue importance to his own services, and undervalue the services of others. No one will forget that the more feeble members of a church are necessary, because they have something to do. There will be cordial sympathy and cooperation growing out of identity of spiritual interests. Such a church will prosper and grow unto a holy temple in the Lord. But if a church fails to learn the lessons referred to, its members will make comparatively no progress in the divine life; they will remain in a state of spiritual infancy; and their knowledge of the gospel will be so meager and superficial as to subject them to the charge brought against the Hebrews: "For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For every one that useth milk is unskillful in the word of righteousness; for he is a babe" (Hebrews 5:12-13).

II. CORRECTIVE DISCIPLINE This phrase implies the imperfection of church-members; their liability to sin. Alas, how many are the proofs of this imperfection; how numerous the illustrations of the liability! Jesus said, "It must needs be that offences come." Depravity makes this certain in society at large; and the remains of depravity render it certain in individual Christians and in Christian churches. In every case of church discipline the honor of Christ and the interests of his cause are more or less affected; and it deserves special notice that the Saviour's injunctions contemplate disciplinary church action as the last resort. Everything else that can be done must first be done to adjust differences and remove offences among brethren. There are two commands of Christ, which, if, faithfully obeyed, would in almost every instance prevent personal offences from assuming such form and magnitude as to require church action. These injunctions are to be found in Matthew 5:23-24 and Matthew 18:15, and they are as follows: "Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." Moreover, if thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone.

According to the former of these passages the brother who is supposed to be the offender is to go to the offended brother. He must go promptly. The necessity of an immediate interview between the parties is so imperative as to justify the suspension of an act of worship till the interview is held. "Leave there thy gift before the altar." The form of expression was no doubt suggested by the sacrificial arrangements of the Mosaic economy. The person addressed is supposed, after getting to the altar, to remember that his brother has something against him. He must not say: "My brother ought not to have anything against me; I have done him no injury; he is laboring under a false impression; his grievance is not real, but imaginary; and it is needless to go to him," etc. But the Master says, "Leave thy gift at the altar and go." Dare the servant disobey his Lord? Let him go and show the offended brother that he has no just cause of complaint, that he is under a false impression, if this is the case. But if, at the altar of God, he remembers that he has done his brother injustice, let him go, if possible, more promptly and, confessing his fault, seek reconciliation. The observance of this first injunction of Christ would lead to the adjustment of a thousand differences among brethren. But, according to the second command, there is something for the offended party to do. "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between

thee and him alone. The offended brother is not to wait till the offender goes to him and seeks reconciliation. The offender may not know that he has given offence that his brother has ought against him. Or if he knows it, he may neglect his duty. This, however, does not affect the obligations of the offended brother. There must be an interview between the parties. The offender, as we have seen is required to go to the offended, and the offended is required to go to the offender; and should they both start at once and meet midway it would be so much the better. It would show such a spirit of obedience to Christ as would make the settlement of the difficulty morally certain. Tell him his fault between him and thee alone. The offended brother is, at this stage of the proceeding, to tell the offender his fault. He must let no one know what he is going to do. He must not ask the advice of any one. He needs no advice. Nothing can be plainer than the command of Christ. Tell him his fault. This is to be done orally. (Note: It has sometimes occurred that the offended brother has chosen to write to the offender rather than state his grievance by word of mouth. This is very reprehensible. Christ does not say write a note or a letter, but go and tell him his fault. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the inclination to write would indicate a wrong spirit. It would betray an unchristian desire to get some advantage, especially if the offended one believed he could wield the pen more effectively than the offender. The language of the Master is, Tell him his fault.) A word is used in the original which suggests the idea of presenting reasons or proofs to convince of a fault. The offended brother is to do this, and if he does, the offender is to acknowledge his fault, ask forgiveness, and there the matter is at an end. If, however, the proofs presented are shown by the accused brother to be insufficient to establish the charge against him, let the party making the charge cheerfully retract it, with expressions of gratification that it is not true, and with expressions of regret that it had been made. Neither party should ever mention the subject again.

TWO CLASSES OF OFFENCES

It has been common to refer to offences requiring discipline as private and public. These epithets of designation are, perhaps, not the best that could be selected. By a private is meant a personal offence, but a personal offence may be publicly committed. Hence the word private is inadequate to express the full idea intended to be conveyed. A public offence as distinguished from a private one is an offence committed in public; but as distinguished from a personal offence it is committed against a church in its collective capacity. It may be committed too, in secret, or in comparative secrecy. For example, theft, with whatever privacy perpetrated, is against good morals, and is therefore what is usually called a public offence. We prefer the use of the epithets personal and general to designate offences. They are sufficiently descriptive for all practical purposes. There might be a third class of offences termed mixed that is partly personal and partly general but we confine this discussions to the two classes indicated.

I. Personal. What is a personal offence? It is an offence against an individual. If thy brother shall trespass against thee. Any offence committed by one brother against another, which, if acknowledged and forgiven by the parties, would leave the fellowship of the church undisturbed, is personal. Such an offence, whether committed in private or public, has to do with the two brethren, and not with the church. It cannot be brought before the church legitimately till the directions of Christ, in Matthew 18:15-16 are complied with. The offended brother, presuming to bring his grievance before the church, in disregard of these directions, would subject himself to church censure; and the church by considering the grievance would violate the law of her Head. The more

this law is studied the more will its wisdom be seen; and the less surprise will be felt at the unhappy consequences resulting from its neglect. In all personal offences the rule to be observed is plain: "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee thou hast gained thy brother." The object of the offended brother must be to gain the offender. If this is not his purpose, he violated the spirit of Christ's law though he may obey it in the letter. He must earnestly hope and pray, that he may be so successful in this first step as not to find it necessary to take the second. It is sometimes the case that it is humiliating to admit it that the first step is taken in an unbrotherly spirit, with the hope that the second will have to be taken, and then the third, so that the offender will be, as speedily as possible, put in the place of "a heathen man and a publican." When this is so it is not hazarding much to say that the offended brother is as censurable as the offender.

"If he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother." It is easy to see that the Saviour refers to this as the accomplishment of an important object which should gratify the aggrieved brother's heart. "Thou hast gained thy brother." What an acquisition, and how sublime the satisfaction arising therefrom! And it may be said, the offending brother is generally gained when there is a sincere desire to gain him expressed, in earnest prayer, that he may be gained. If the brother is gained, proceedings happily end, and dearest friends of the parties must not know, if the offence is a private one, that the adjusted difficulty ever existed. Or if the personal offence has been publicly committed it is enough for it to be known that the matter has been satisfactorily settled. It is better not to talk about the details of the adjustment. But there will be cases in which the offending brother is not "gained." What then is to be done? The second step to be taken is this: If he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established." The brethren selected by the aggrieved brother to go with him should be very judicious and eminently spiritual. Sound judgment and ardent piety will be needed. If the charge made by the plaintiff in the case is denied by the defendant—that is, if there be an issue of veracity between the parties—and no third person knows anything of the matter, it must be dropped. The "one or two more" present must so advise and insist. The parties concerned stand on a perfect equality as members of the church, and the veracity of one is to be considered as unquestionable as that of the other. It will not do for the brethren whom the offended brother has taken with him to yield a credence to his statements which they withhold from the statements of the other. Whatever may be their private opinions as to the Christian and moral character of the parties, they must be treated alike. Hence we repeat, that if there is an issue of veracity, on which no third person can shed light, the case must be dropped. But the Saviour's language supposes that the case may be continued. The offender may not deny the charge brought against him, but may attempt to justify himself as to the thing complained of. It may be evident to the "one or two more" who are present, that he has a wrong spirit, and that, from his own account of the matter he has given the aggrieved brother just cause of offence. Here then is the place for them to exercise Christian judgment and show the spirit of the gospel. They must, if possible, convince the offender of his fault, and secure from him a reparation of the injury he has done the offended brother. If he is convinced that he has done wrong, and makes a satisfactory acknowledgment, it must be received. Or, if the acknowledgment is not satisfactory to the aggrieved brother, while those he has taken with him think it should be, they must say so, and urge him to accept it. It must be the object of their anxious desire to have the difference adjusted in accordance with the law of Christ. If this is done, let the parties concerned say nothing more about the matter, and let the brethren

who have aided in the adjustment hold their peace. But there is another supposition: It is supposed that a reconciliation may not be effected and that the "one or two" may be called to testify as witnessed before the church. "That in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established." Now the third and last step is to be taken by the offended brother: "Tell it to the church." The church, till this point is reached, has nothing to do with the matter. The discipline, strictly speaking, has not been church discipline, but the discipline of brethren in their individual character. In a meeting of the church the aggrieved brother states that, in his judgment, he has just cause of offence against a fellow member, and asks permission to present the facts in the case. The pastor, or presiding officer, must inquire of him if he has gone to the offending brother and told him his fault, no third person being present? If he answers in the negative, the pastor must tell him kindly, but firmly, that he cannot be permitted to state his grievance. If he answers in the affirmative, the pastor must ask him if he with "one or two more" has gone to the offending brother, taking the second step enjoined by Christ. If he answers negatively, the pastor must say: "The rule which governs us will not permit you to tell your grievance to the church till the second step is taken as well as the first." If he answers affirmatively, he can name the brethren he took with him, who can corroborate his statement. The pastor can then say, according to the law of Christ, you can now make your statement. He tells his grievance to the church. The offender, it may be, admits that the cause of complaint is stated just as it was at the two previous interviews, or if he says it is not, the witnesses can testify as to the statement made in their presence. Every word said at the second interview between the parties is to be established by the witnesses. The offender may still attempt to justify himself. The witnesses may repeat the arguments they used to convince him that he was in the wrong; and the church seeing him in the wrong, may admonish him to make reparation of the injury he has done. If the offender should, at this point in the proceedings, "hear the church" "that is, carry her advice into practical effect" the matter ends and he retains his membership. But, "If he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." The intimation here is, that a refusal to hear the church will be followed by the act of exclusion, which is a public withdrawal of fellowship. Having been excluded he becomes to the offended member, and to all the members, "as a heathen man and a publican." There is a cessation of Christian intercourse.

2. General Offences. It has been stated that a general offence, as distinguished from a personal one, is committed against a church in its collective capacity. That is to say, it is committed against no member in particular, but against all the members in general "against one member as much as another. To this definition it may be added that while all general offences are against churches as bodies, some are, and some are not, violations of the law of public morals. For example, drunkenness, theft, lying, etc., violate the law of morality, and may be considered offences against society at large as well as against the churches of Christ; but the espousal of false and heretical doctrines by a church-member, though an offence against the church, is not a crime against society. It does not invade the domain of public morals.

While it does not comport with the limits or the design of the volume to give an exhaustive catalogue of general offences, it is believed that the most of them may be classified as follows:

I. A rejection of any of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel. According to the constitution of the human mind the denial of fundamental truth is the belief of fundamental error. The apostle Paul attached great importance to what he termed "the truth of the gospel," and knowing that he had

preached the gospel in its purity to the Galatians, he said: "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again. If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed?" (Galatians 1:8-9). The beloved disciple, proverbial for kindness of heart, said with great firmness, "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed. For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds?" (2 John 1:10-11). As the gospel is the charter of the church's incorporation, it is plain that a denial of any of the essential doctrines of the gospel is an offence against the church, and calls for its disciplinary action. And then too, every church by virtue of its constitution is the guardian of "the truth as it is in Jesus." How can its guardianship be effective, if it does not put fundamental errorists without the pale of its fellowship? Paul said to Titus: "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject." The term "heretic" in this passage, no doubt, means an instigator of divisions; but why does the heretic become such an instigator? Because, ordinarily, he has embraced false doctrines which place him in antagonism with the church, and make him the head of a faction. He is, therefore, a proper subject of church discipline. It will be observed that reference has been made to fundamental errors, and these errors are supposed to be inconsistent with true piety. There are errors, however, of a lower grade, which, while they do not promote piety, are not subversive of it. With regard to these a judicious toleration must be exercised - such a toleration as is suggested by the words of the apostle: "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye." While in the flesh, individual Christians and Christian churches will find it necessary to bear with errors in sentiment and imperfections in practice; but they must tolerate nothing which is virtually subversive of the gospel. Loyalty to Christ forbids this.

2. Anything that seriously disturbs the union and peace of a church. The New Testament teaches nothing more plainly than, that while a church meets together "in one place," it should be "of one accord, of one mind." Its members are required to be united in love; for while truth is the basis, love is the cement of their union. How reasonable that they love one another, and that out of their love should grow a union sacred and inviolable! They are children of the same Father "redeemed by the same blood" "regenerated by the same Spirit" "baptized into the same body" "bound by solemn covenant to live according to the gospel" "and animated with the bright prospect of immortal glory. Surely there should be union and peace among the members of such a congregation of the Lord. Alas, the union may be disturbed "the peace broken. The seeds of discord may be sown and everything thrown out of harmony. This was sometimes the case in the days of the apostles. Hence Paul says: "Mark them which cause divisions, and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ." The union and peace of a church may not only be disturbed by the espousal of false doctrines, but also by the adoption of false views of church polity. Suppose a member, for instance, while holding to what are termed "the doctrines of grace," should deny the necessity of regeneration in order to church-membership [sic], or the necessity of immersion in order to baptism [sic], or should have his own children christened in infancy, or should insist on the right of unbelievers to come to the table of the Lord; every one can see that the union and peace of a church, organized according to the scriptural model, would be seriously disturbed. Such a disturber would deserve church discipline, and fidelity on the part of his offended brethren would institute the process without delay.

3. Disorderly and immoral conduct in all its forms. There is reference to disorderly conduct in the following passages: "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly... For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies?" (2 Thessalonians 3:6, 2 Thessalonians 3:11). For a church to withdraw from a disorderly brother is equivalent to his exclusion. There is a cessation of church fellowship. In the subjoined passage immoral conduct is referred to. "But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat?" (1 Corinthians 5:11). These terms, so expressive of immorality, are used, no doubt, to denote specimen classes of wicked persons. The term fornicator, for example, is to be understood as embracing all those who commit sexual iniquities. There is no express mention of murderers, liars, thieves, etc., but they are unquestionably included, with all other wicked characters, as guilty of general offences which call for church action. Alas, that these offences so often occur.

How general offences are to be treated. The impression prevails, to a great extent, that, because general offences are committed against a church as a body, they need not be treated after the manner of personal offences. True, they cannot be treated alike in all respects, but there should not be such a difference of treatment as is often seen. In some churches there is scarcely a private, personal effort made to convince of their guilt those who have committed general offences. This is wrong. A heretic is guilty of a general offence; but, according to Paul he is not to be rejected till "after the first and second admonition." The reference is no doubt to the program of discipline as arranged by Christ in Matthew 18:1-35. It cannot be too earnestly urged that private, personal effort be made with brethren who have committed general offences. They will be much more likely to show a Christian spirit when thus dealt with than when their offences are, without preliminary steps, made the subject of church investigation. These private, personal exertions are considered proofs of kindness, and there is something in human nature which revolts and rebels against public exposure. In Galatians 6:1-2 it is written: "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted. Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ." It will be seen that the restoration of the offender is the object to be sought. It is to be sought by the "spiritual" in the "spirit of meekness." While prosecuting this object they are to consider their own liability to be overcome by temptation, and make necessary allowances for the offending brother. They are, as nearly as possible, to place themselves in his position, and take on their hearts the burden which, it may be, is crushing his. This would be fulfilling the law of Christ "that law is love; and love prompts us to bear the burdens of those we love. When the inspired directions of the apostle are faithfully followed, the brother "overtaken in a fault" usually confesses it, and gives satisfaction to those seeking his restoration. This is an auspicious result, and it must be announced at the next meeting of the church. The offence having been general, the church must be satisfied. Ordinarily, what satisfies the brother or brethren seeking the offender's restoration satisfies the church.

Sometimes the most earnest exertions to reclaim a brother fail of success. Then the case must be brought before the church. The facts connected with it must be stated. The arraigned member must have ample opportunity to defend himself. If his defence is satisfactory to the church the matter goes no farther. Or if the brother, while the investigation is going on, becomes convinced of

his guilt and makes confession, the church must forgive him. If, however, the offence is established by conclusive proof, and there is no penitence leading to confession, the act of exclusion must take place. The church must withdraw its fellowship.

Offences of an infamous or scandalous character must have a peculiar treatment. The church must express its reprobation of them by an immediate act of exclusion. No preliminary steps are necessary. No penitence must prevent the withdrawal of fellowship. The honor of Christ and the purity of his religion are especially involved in these cases. What Paul says in regard to the incestuous man (1 Corinthians 5:1-13) vindicates the position here taken. If a church-member is guilty of adultery, or murder, or perjury, or theft, or forgery, or drunkenness, or any kindred crime, he deserves exclusion without trial. Some perhaps would except drunkenness from this catalogue, but taking into account the manifold evils of intemperance, in connection with the light shed on the temperance question for thirty years past, one instance of drunkenness makes it the duty of a church promptly to exercise its power of excommunication. No church can adequately express a suitable abhorrence of such offences without excluding the offender. Nor can the world be otherwise convinced that the church is the friend and the conservator of good morals.

HOW EXCLUDED MEMBERS OUGHT TO BE TREATED This is a question of no little importance; for the practical answer to it has much to do with the effect of church discipline. Social intercourse with the excluded is not to be entirely suspended; for then many opportunities of doing them good will be lost; neither is it to be just as before the exclusion; for that would impair the efficacy of discipline. The members of a church must so act toward those they have expelled as to give the expulsion its legitimate moral influence. The apostle Paul lays down this rule: "If any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no, not to eat?" (1 Corinthians 5:11). That is, we must not keep company with such an one. There must be no social familiarity as the excluded may construe into a connivance at their offences. Andrew Fuller well remarks: "If individual members act contrary to this rule, and carry it freely toward an offender, as if nothing had taken place, it will render the censure of the church of none effect. Those persons also who behave in this manner will be considered by the party as his friends, and others who stand aloof as his enemies, or at least as being unreasonably severe; which will work confusion, and render void the best and most wholesome discipline. We must act in concert, or we may as well do nothing. Members who violate this rule are partakers of other men's sins, and deserve the rebukes of the church for counteracting its measures." [Footnote: Works, Vol. III, pp. 334-335.] We dismiss the topic by a reference to 2 Thessalonians 3:14-15: "And if any one obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother."

OBJECTS TO BE HAD IN VIEW IN DISCIPLINE Prominent among these objects are:

1. The glory of God. Whatever makes corrective church discipline necessary dishonors God. The greater its necessity the more is God dishonored. The need of discipline in all its stages arises from the fact that there is a state of things in conflict with the will of God. Whatever is in conflict with his will tarnishes his glory. If then God is to be honored, and his glory promoted in the churches, discipline must be exercised to correct that which is in conflict with his will, and which obscures his glory. Our God is infinitely holy, and the neglect of discipline, when either personal or

general offences require it, virtually represents him as the patron of iniquity. Let the churches tremble at this thought, and remember that the holy God they serve is also a jealous God.

2. Purity of the Churches. The followers of Christ, though in the world, are not of the world. They are called out of darkness into marvelous light-called to be saints-called with a holy calling-and in their embodied form as churches they are the depositaries of the pure principles of the gospel. They are Christ's representatives in the world-lights of the world, cities set on hills which cannot be hidden. Paul said to the Corinthians: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?" (2 Corinthians 6:14-15). These significant questions show that the spirit of Christianity and the spirit of the world are utterly irreconcilable. And if so, the churches of the saints, to maintain their purity, must apply the rod of corrective discipline to all who live unworthily of the gospel. They must do this to vindicate "the truth as it is in Jesus," and to represent his religion as the antagonist of whatever is evil. With special reference to the necessity of expelling an unworthy member (1 Corinthians 5:1) an apostle says, "Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?" As if he had said, "Are you ignorant that the retention of a flagrant transgressor will corrupt the entire church?" The purity of the churches cannot be preserved without faithful discipline. And every church virtually endorses the wrongs she does not, by disciplinary action, attempt to correct.

3. The spiritual good of the disciplined. This is a third object to be kept in view in all disciplinary proceedings. We have seen already that in matters of personal offence the "gaining" of the offending brother is to be specially regarded. Those who have been "overtaken in a fault" are, if possible, to be restored. And when a church passes an act of exclusion-delivering a member over to Satan "that is, formally transferring him from Christ's jurisdiction to that of the devil" it must be done, "that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." There must be no bitterness of feeling, no disposition to persecute and oppress, no indulgence of revengeful impulses. The act of expulsion must be considered a painful necessity, and should be passed by the church with great solemnity and pronounced by the pastor with a still greater solemnity. Everything should be so done as to make the impression on all that it is an awful thing to be cut off from the fellowship of God's people. It would be well for an earnest prayer to be offered that the disciplinary action may prove a blessing to the offender, exert a salutary influence on the church, and impress the community with the holiness of the religion of Jesus.

It is suggested that it might be well for every pastor, the next Lord's Day after the exclusion of a member, to announce the fact to the congregation. Sometimes a church is considered by men of the world as endorsing an unworthy character because they do not know of the act of exclusion. It should, in some way, be made known.

01.07. Chapter 7

CHAPTER VII THE DUTIES OF A CHURCH

Though some of the duties of a church have been incidentally referred to in preceding chapters, the subject is too important to be dismissed without a more distinct consideration. It is plain that Christ, in providing for the formation of churches, recognized and sanctified the social principle. A church is a society ? a social principle. Its members, while they sustain a supremely sacred relation to their Head, sustain important relations to one another. They are ?no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints and of the household of God? (Ephesians 2:19). In this passage two metaphors are employed, one of which represents a church as a commonwealth, and the other as a family. Fellow citizens with the saints, of a spiritual commonwealth, is one of the apostle?s conceptions. This citizenship denotes a state the opposite of that indicated by the term ?strangers and foreigners,? or rather strangers and sojourners. The citizen has duties to perform and privileges to enjoy, which do not concern the stranger at all, and the sojourner to a very limited extent. The citizen occupies not only an honorable, but a responsible position, and fellow citizens are expected to act in concert. The other conception of the apostle represents a church as a household, a family of God. A literal translation would be domestics of God ? that is, belonging to his family. The point we make is that the members of a church, whether considered as fellow citizens of God?s commonwealth, or as belonging to his family, have something to do. Their duties are urgent, imperative, sacred.

1. They owe duties to one another. Paul in one place refers to the self-edification of a church. His language is ?unto the edifying of itself in love.? There is something at fault with every church that does not build itself up on its most holy faith. There should be constant growth in grace. And as the thrifty plant or vigorous tree grows in all its parts, so should there be spiritual growth in all the members of a church. There must abound in supreme love to Christ and in fervent love for one another.

Christian love is the great duty of church-members, which, when faithfully performed, secures the performance of all other duties that they owe one another. If they remember the words of Jesus ? ?a new commandment give I unto you that ye love one another? ? they will not forget the many ways in which this love may express itself. Toward the pastor it will show itself in respect for his teachings, in obedience to his admonitions, and in imitation of his example, so far as he follows Christ. It will provide an adequate pecuniary support for him that he may give himself to his work, unperplexed with cares concerning that things of this life.

Christian love will prompt the members of a church to do good to one another as they have opportunity. ?To do good? is a very comprehensive phrase. It is generic and includes under it all the specific methods of doing good. It embraces all forms of labor for the welfare of the body and specially those which concern the soul. It does not overlook the interests of time, but looks supremely to the interests of eternity.

There is another inspired expression deserving special notice ? ?forbearing one another in love.? This implies that church-members will have occasion to exercise their forbearance. Alas, they often have. Their long-suffering is tried, their patience put to the test. Sometimes it seems wonderful how much they can bear and forbear. It would be inexplicable, but for the words, ?IN LOVE? forbearing one another in love. Love covers a multitude of faults. It makes Christians look leniently on the frailties, weaknesses, and imperfections of their fellow Christians. It makes them bear patiently what they cannot approve, and bear it till it assumes a form that calls for the exercise of that discipline which the Lord Jesus has given his churches ?for edification, and not for destruction.? ?Forbearing one another in love? would be a suitable church motto. In treating of the duties which church-members owe one to another, it is well to refer briefly to the duty of:

Seeking out and encouraging whatever ministerial gifts there may be in the membership. This is very important matter. We doubt not there are many young men in our churches who ought to preach the gospel. They have impressions on the subjects. They look on the work of the ministry as so responsible that they recoil from it with trembling. They feel their incompetency; and, in view of ministerial duties and trials, repeat the stereotyped question, ?Who is sufficient for these things?? These are the very men who need to be sought out and encouraged. Their views of the greatness of the work of preaching the gospel are correct. Their self-distrust is altogether commendable. The ablest of the Lord?s ministers once felt as they now feel. They need instruction. Let them be encouraged to speak and exhort in prayer-meetings, and soon it will be seen that they possess ministerial gifts. It devolves specially on pastors, and the more judicious of the brethren, to train these future ministers for usefulness; and, wherever money is needed for the education of any of them, the churches ought cheerfully to furnish it. There is no pecuniary investment so productive as that made in ministerial education. But it must ever be remembered that piety is the preacher?s first and most important qualification, without which the greatest talents, and the richest stores of learning, will make him as ?sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.?

2. A church owes duties to the world. The term world is here used to denote impenitent sinners. Every Christian by the very process which makes him a Christian is brought under obligation to do what he can to lead others to Christ. And when individual believers are embodied in churches their obligations not only remain in full force, but the facilities of usefulness are increased. Church-members must recognize these obligations, and avail themselves of these facilities. They must labor for the salvation of souls under the distinct impression that the grace which has saved them can save others. Thus only can they labor in faith and hope. The following are some of the methods in which church-members may perform their duties to impenitent sinners.

1. By personal conversations with them about their souls. Christians must not forget that the faculty of speech has been given for important purposes, and should be used accordingly. Few things are more to be desired among church-members than a consecration of the power of speech. Conversational talent needs to be improved and sanctified. How can the tongue be so worthily employed as in speaking of the ?great salvation"? What theme so momentous, so precious, so sublime? Christians must not only ?speak often one to another,? but they must converse with the impenitent about their souls.

It is not important that their ideas be presented with logical precision and rhetorical beauty; but it is indispensable that the love of Christ animate their hearts and prompt their speech. The members

of every church should see to it that every impenitent sinner within the bounds of the congregation is conversed with on the subject of religion and urged to accept the salvation of the gospel. It must not be said in truth by even one of the unregenerate "no man cared for my soul." Such a declaration truthfully made would be a reproach to any church. Let it not be made; but let the church-member show their interest in the welfare of the impenitent by personal conversation with them on the weighty concerns of eternity.

2. By the maintenance of Sunday Schools. The Sunday School is not designed to supersede, but to aid family instruction. It must be remembered always that religious training in the family cannot be dispensed with. Parental obligations can no more be transferred than parental relations can be changed. But it may be assumed as a fact, that those parents who are most faithful in "bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," most gladly avail themselves of the aid furnished by Sunday School instruction. And then how many ungodly parents are to be found everywhere who are incompetent to give their children religious training, and who would not, if they were competent! Are these children to be uncared for? No, nor those whose parents are dead. The sympathies of all generous hearts are enlisted in behalf of orphans. All children are suitable subjects for the Sunday School. Whether their parents are pious, or ungodly, or dead, let all the children be gathered together to receive religious training on the Lord's Day. Superintendents and teachers of Sunday Schools must remember that scriptural instruction is the one thing to be kept in view. Literary instruction, properly so-called, is given in week-day schools. The impartation and reception of scriptural knowledge are the distinguishing features of the Sunday School. Great care should be exercised in the selection of Sunday School libraries. Books inculcating erroneous views must be rejected, and the literature provided for the children must be religious and evangelical.

Sunday School teachers should make it a point to urge, by personal appeal, the claims of the gospel on every scholar. Every such appeal ought to be preceded, accompanied, and followed by earnest prayer to God for his blessing. Without his favor no effort to do good will be successful; with his approving smile no effort will be unsuccessful.

It is proper to say a few words as to the relation of Sunday Schools to the churches. Ordinarily, these schools are formed by the churches and are permitted to use their houses of worship. They should be carried on under the general direction of the churches, and be held responsible thereto. A church should regard its Sunday as one of the agencies by which to meet its obligations to train the rising generation in the fear of God. And when this is the case the church is really at work in the Sunday School. It would be a happy circumstance if facts would authorize this definition of a Sunday School: A CHURCH ACTIVELY AT WORK ON THE LORD'S DAY FOR THE GOOD OF THE CHILDREN.

"The classes in the school," it has been well said, "should be composed, not simply of children, but also of the grown-up people in the neighborhood" — grandfathers and grandmothers, fathers and mothers, and men and women. The school should be considered one of the regular meetings of the church. Pastors should summon the entire people to assemble on the Lord's Day, either as teachers or as scholars. It should be considered as strange for fathers and mothers to stay away from the Bible classes as for boys and girls to absent themselves from the Sunday School. That pastor who will speak to his congregation on this topic three minutes before sermon each Lord's

Day for one year, and then work to get up classes as he may be able through the week, will be astonished at the results. And ten years of such efforts by all the ministers of the gospel would work a complete revolution in the churches. Instances might be given to show that a church sometimes more than doubles its power by employing its private members in this way.?

3. By the distribution of the Bible, religious books, tracts, etc. This is another method by which a church may do good to the impenitent. God has given to the world one book. It is unlike all other books. It carries with it, wherever it goes, the credentials of its inspiration and claims the reverence due to a communication from heaven. The Bible is God's gift to the world. It was not given to the white man, nor the red man, nor the black man, as such, but to universal man. This volume alone unfolds the way of salvation by telling the wonders of the cross. It is revealed truth by means of which the soul is regenerated, sanctified, and prepared for heaven. Who is to see to it that this precious book is distributed at home and abroad? It cannot be reasonably expected that God's enemies will do it. His friends must engage in the work. They know something of the value of the Bible, and their sense of its worth must prompt them to circulate it. Every church should consider itself, by virtue of its constitution, a Bible Society, and should aid in the great work of disseminating divine truth throughout the world. It is a question that may well be pondered with solemn interest: Will God, in his providence, long permit any people to retain his word, if that people do not give it to others? Let every church think of this. The distribution of religious books, tracts, and periodicals is a work kindred to the circulation of the Scriptures. Religious books are reproductions and expositions of some of the truths of the inspired volume. A good book brings a portion of divine truth into contact with the conscience and heart. And this is the reason why the unobtrusive tract is so useful. A special use should be made of the tracts and pamphlets that set forth the distinctive principles of the denomination. THE PUBLICATION SOCIETY is publishing a very large variety of tracts, pamphlets, and books. Copies of these should be circulated by hundreds of thousands. As a people, we claim that certain great truths have been committed to our care. For what did the Lord commit them to us? ? to pass them over as unimportant? We dare not do this. These principles are not ours to do with as may seem most agreeable. They are Christ's. He has honored us with their custody, not for ourselves, but for others. Upon us he has placed the especial responsibility of commending them. In common with all other Christians it is our duty to bear testimony to all truths, but specially to our distinctive principles. We owe it to ourselves, we owe it to Christ our Lord, and we owe it to our brethren dearly beloved, but in error, to make known these principles to the very utmost of our ability. The mission of Baptists will not be attained by apologizing to the world for an existence, by asking pardon of other denominations for differing from them, or by begging that we may not be esteemed as bigots. We must become aggressive in spirit, positive in the advocacy of our principles. And these truths can be made known best by the free and wide-spread circulation of our denominational tracts, pamphlets, and books. Let them, then, be freely used. Tracts cost but little ? only one dollar for a thousand pages sent free of postage. What an irresistible, all-pervading power might be called into being by the churches, if they would but address themselves with determination and perseverance to the gradual but perpetual distribution of these tracts, pamphlets, and books!

How greatly might converts be guarded from erroneous views and practices, be indoctrinated in the principles of the gospel and faith of the church, and be made substantial Christians, if with the hand of fellowship, the pastor could give to each one received the best small work on Baptism,

another on Communion, and another still on the Duties of Church-members! And the pastor should not hesitate to ask the church to supply him with these aids in his work.

4. By sustaining the cause of missions. The missionary enterprise is usually referred to in its two aspects ? home and foreign. There is full scriptural authority for the presentation of both these aspects. The commission of Christ to the apostles of itself furnishes it: ?Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature: He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned,? (Mark 16:15-16). It is clear from this commission that the gospel is to be preached at home and abroad; for it is to be preached in all the world. It is to be proclaimed to all the nations; for it is to be proclaimed to every creature. ?Ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth,? (Acts 1:8). This was the program of missionary labor in apostolic times. How suggestive the words, Jerusalem ? all Judea ? Samaria ? uttermost part of the earth. This was the plan and zealously was it executed.

It may be laid down as an axiom that no church, not animated with the missionary spirit, can be in a healthful, prosperous state. The missionary spirit is the spirit of the gospel ? the spirit of Christ. Of every church it ought to be said in truth as of the Thessalonians: ?From you sounded out the word of the Lord.? The should go forth till it reaches the remotest limits of the earth. It is the sound of the word of the Lord. The word of the Lord is the gospel by which sinners of all nations may be saved. ?For whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent?? (Romans 10:13-15).

Indifference to the cause of missions is cruelty to immortal souls. How are sinners in our own land, or in foreign lands, to be saved without the gospel? Ought not those who have the gospel to send it to those who have it not? Earth's wretched millions are starving for ?the bread of life,? and this bread is in the custody of the churches. Dare they refuse to distribute it among the perishing at home and abroad? No church can perform its duties to the world without sustaining the cause of missions ? without giving, according to its ability, to spread the gospel of the grace of God. Praying without giving is presumption, and giving without praying indicates a self-dependence offensive to God. Let it be said, as of Cornelius, so of every church: ?Thy prayers and thine alms are come up as a memorial before God.? When prayers and alms go together, there is a happy conjunction.

NOTE. ? The subject of this chapter ? Duties of a Church ? might be expanded into volumes. Our narrow limits have required its compression. It may be said, in conclusion, that a church with the New Testament for its charter of incorporation, is constitutionally a society, organized for the promotion of Christian objects. These objects should be prosecuted so zealously by all church-members as to make it apparent that no secret or secular organization is needed to carry forward any benevolent or Christian work. And besides, what ever good church-members do, should be done ins their Christian character.

01.08. Appendixes

APPENDIX I. Business Meetings of a Church II. Forms of Minutes, Letters, etc.
III. Marriage Ceremony IV. Province of Associations and Councils

01.08.01. Appendix 1

CHURCH MANUAL

APPENDIX I. BUSINESS MEETINGS OF A CHURCH, ASSOCIATIONS, ETC. WHERE the spirit of Christian love and courtesy prevails, very few rules are necessary in the transaction of church business. The pastor of a church, by virtue of his office, is its moderator. He therefore presides at its meetings, which should be opened with singing, reading a suitable portion of Scripture, and prayer. The clerk then reads the minutes of the last meeting, and the pastor states, that if there is no motion to amend, the minutes will stand approved. If corrections are necessary, they are made, that the records may show exactly what has been done. The items of business should be taken up thus: 1. Unfinished business; 2. Reports from committees; 3. New business. It is not necessary to make a motion to take up unfinished business. It is before the church and must be acted on unless a motion to postpone its consideration prevails. So of reports from committees. Under the item of new business any brother can mention what in his judgment, claims the consideration of the church; but in all matters of importance it is desirable that there should be some previous consultation among the most prudent brethren as to what new business shall be introduced. Nothing has been said as to the time of receiving members, because some churches prefer that this shall be done directly after the devotional exercises; others that it shall be done after all other business is transacted; while others, still, receive members, not at business, but at covenant and prayer meetings.

CONCERNING MOTIONS A motion made, and not seconded, does not claim the moderator's notice; but if seconded, he must state it to the meeting. This must be done before there is any discussion. While a motion is undergoing discussion no new motion can be presented. But it is in order to move to amend a motion by adding or striking out words, phrases, and sentences. It is even parliamentary to move to amend by striking out all after the word Resolved, and introducing new matter in conflict with the original proposition. This, however, is not an amendment, but a substitute. An amendment must be germane to the matter embraced in the motion: a substitute is intended to supercede it. Some suppose a motion can be withdrawn by the mover any time before the vote is taken. Others think that after a motion comes regularly before the meeting it cannot be withdrawn except by consent of the body. The practice of deliberative bodies is conforming more and more to the latter view. Unanimous consent, however, is not necessary. When an amendment to a motion is accepted by the mover no vote on the amendment is to be taken; if the mover does not accept it, a separate vote must be taken on the amendment, and then on the original proposition. It is in order to move an amendment to an amendment, but this is the utmost limit to which the matter can go, and seldom should go so far.

PRIVILEGED QUESTIONS

These embrace motions to adjourn, to lay on the table, to have the previous question, to amend, to commit, to postpone. They are called privileged because, it is supposed, they can be made at any time. This, however, is not strictly true; for even the question of adjournment, which takes

precedence of all other questions, cannot be presented while a member is speaking, or a vote is being taken; nor can a motion to adjourn, which has been negative, be renewed until some other proposition is made, or other business is transacted. [FOOTNOTE: Writers on Parliamentary Rules differ as to what are privileged questions. Jefferson, in his "Manual," includes all named above except the "previous question." Matthias, in his "Rules of Order," embraces all except the motion to lay on the table. Cushing, in his "Manual," reduces privileged questions to three, namely: adjournment, questions of privilege, and orders of the day; while he ranks as "Subsidiary Questions" the following: Lie on the table, previous question, postponement, commitment, amendment.] It will rarely be necessary in the transaction of business in churches, associations, etc., to call for the previous question. When, however, a motion for the previous question is made and seconded, the moderator will say, "Shall the main question now be put?" If the decision is affirmative, the meeting votes, without further discussion, on the original motion. If the meeting decides that the main question shall not be put?it indicates a desire that the discussion shall go on. NOT DEBATABLE

Certain motions are not debatable, such as the motion to adjourn, to have the previous question, to lay on the table, etc. But when these motions are modified by some condition of time, place, or purpose, they become debatable.

MOTIONS TO RECONSIDER A motion to reconsider a proposition formerly adopted must be made by one who voted with the majority. If such a motion prevails, the original matter is before the body, as if it had never been acted on.

POINTS OF ORDER, APPEAL

If a member in debate violates any recognized rule of order, it is the business of the moderator to call him to order. Or, any other member may present a point of order, which the moderator must decide. If the decision is unsatisfactory, an appeal may be taken to the body; but this should be done only in peculiar cases.

MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS In stating a motion or taking a vote the moderator should rise from his seat.

If there is an equal division of votes, the moderator may give the casting vote, or he may, more prudently in most cases, decline voting. If he declines, the matter is decided in the negative. It is not desirable for any question that comes before a church to be decided by a majority of one vote, and for that vote to be the pastor's. No member can speak except on some definite subject before the body unless he wishes to explain why he is about to make a motion. It is generally better to make a motion and then, after it is seconded, speak in explanation and defence of it. When blanks are to be filled, if different numbers are proposed, the vote must be taken first on the largest number, the longest time, etc. If a deliberative body decides beforehand to adjourn at a certain hour, when that hour comes the moderator, without waiting for a motion to adjourn, must pronounce the meeting adjourned.

01.08.02. Appendix 2

II. FORMS OF MINUTES, LETTERS, ETC.

There are no invariable forms, but the following are recommended as generally suitable:

1. RECORD OF CHURCH MEETING PHILADELPHIA, Aug. 8, 1867 The _____ church met for business at _____ o'clock, the pastor presiding. After devotional exercises the minutes of the last meeting were read and approved.

[After this whatever business is done must be recorded.]

Adjourned.

_____, Clerk.

2. LETTER OF DISMISSION PHILADELPHIA, Aug. 15, 1867 The _____ Baptist church of _____. To her sister, the _____ Baptist church of _____.

Dear Brethren: This certifies that _____ is a member with us in good standing and full fellowship. At _____ own request _____ is hereby dismissed from us to unite with you. When received by you _____ connection with us will terminate. By order of the church.

_____, Church Clerk. This letter will be valid for _____ months.

3. LETTER OF NOTIFICATION PHILADELPHIA, Sept. 5, 1867. To the _____ church.

Dear Brethren:

You are hereby notified that _____ was received by letter from you to membership in the _____ church, _____ 1867.

_____, Church Clerk.

4. LETTERS OF COMMENDATION

These are usually given by pastors to members who expect to be absent from home for a time. They are substantially as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, July 4, 1867. This certifies that _____ is a member of the _____ Baptist church in this place, in good standing, and is commended to the Christian fellowship of all sister churches.

_____ Pastor _____ Baptist church.

5. CALL FOR A COUNCIL OF RECOGNITION PHILADELPHIA, Aug. 10, 1867. To the _____ Baptist church in _____.

Dear Brethren:

There is a company of brethren and sisters in the Lord who wish to become an independent church. You are therefore requested to send your pastor and two brethren to meet in council at _____ at _____ o'clock, to take the matter into consideration. If the council approves the movement, said brethren and sisters will be glad to have the moral influence of its recognition. The following churches are invited to send messengers: _____, _____, _____, _____.

Yours, truly, _____,
Committee.

6. CALL FOR A COUNCIL OF ORDINATION PHILADELPHIA, Aug. 20, 1867 The _____ Baptist church of _____. To the _____ Baptist church of _____.

Dear Brethren:

We request you to send your pastor and two brethren to meet in council _____ at _____ o'clock, to consider the propriety of ordaining to the work of ministry brother _____. The following churches are invited to send messengers: _____, _____. By order of the church, _____, Clerk.

7. CALL FOR AN ADVISORY COUNCIL PHILADELPHIA, Aug. 10, 1867 The _____ Baptist church of _____. To the _____ Baptist church of _____.

Dear Brethren:

We are sorry to inform you that there are serious difficulties among us, disturbing our peace and hindering our usefulness as a church. We therefore request you to send your pastor and two brethren to meet in council, to advise us what to do. The following churches are invited to send messengers: _____, _____, _____. By order of the church, _____, Clerk.

8. RECORD OF A CHURCH PHILADELPHIA, Aug. 30, 1867 A council, called by the _____ church, met _____ at _____ o'clock. Brother _____ was chosen moderator, and brother _____, clerk. Prayer by _____. The church records, referring to the call of the council, were read, from which it appears that the object is _____. The credentials of the messengers were presented. The following churches sent the following brethren, namely:

CHURCHES. MESSENGERS.

[Whatever is done must be faithfully recorded.] On motion the council was dissolved.

_____, Moderator.
_____, Clerk.

9. FORM OF MINISTERIAL LICENSE PHILADELPHIA, Sept. 8, 1867. This is to certify, that brother _____ is a member of the _____ Baptist church, in good standing and full fellowship. Trusting that God has called him to preach the gospel, we hereby license him to engage in the great work; and we offer to God our earnest prayers that he may

become ?a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.? By order of the church, this _____ day of _____, 18_____.

_____, Pastor.

_____, Clerk.

10. CERTIFICATE OF ORDINATION This is to certify that brother _____ was ordained to the work of the gospel ministry, by prayer and the laying on of the hands of the eldership, on the _____ day of _____, 18_____. He was called to ordination by the _____ church of which he was a member, which had ample opportunity to become acquainted with his piety and ministerial gifts. The ordaining council was composed of _____ brethren from _____ churches, who after a deliberate and thorough examination of the candidate cordially recommended him for ordination. Our beloved brother, the bearer of this paper, has therefore, the entire approbation of the ordaining council in being publicly set apart to preach the gospel and administer the ordinances of Christ. May he, like Barnabas, be ?full of the Holy Spirit and of faith,? and through him may ?much people be added to the Lord.?

_____, Moderator, _____, Clerk.

01.08.03. Appendix 3

III. MARRIAGE CEREMONY

Marriage is an institution of divine appointment, given in wisdom and kindness, to increase human happiness and to support social order. In the Bible, which should be the lamp to your path in every relation, you will find the directions needed in this. In token of your decided choice of each other as partners for life, you _____ and _____ will please to unite your right hands.

(Joining of hands.) Do you solemnly promise, before Almighty God and these witnesses, to receive each other as husband and wife, agreeing to perform the duties growing out of the relation, pledging yourselves to love each other, and to make every reasonable exertion to promote each other's happiness until the union into which you are now entering is dissolved by death?

(When a ring is employed the following can be used. In confirmation of these vows, you will please give and receive this ring, as an emblem and pledge of the pure and enduring love you have promised to cherish for each others.) In view of the promises thus made, I do now, by virtue of the authority vested in me, as a minister of the gospel, pronounce you husband and wife, henceforth in interest and destiny, as in affection, ONE. And what God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

01.08.04. Appendix 4

IV. THE PROVINCE OF ASSOCIATIONS AND COUNCILS

It is customary among Baptists for the churches, according to their convenience, to form District ASSOCIATIONS. These bodies are composed of messengers from the churches. And as no fixed number of churches is necessary in organizing an association, it may be either large or small. Every church acts voluntarily in connecting itself with an association. There is not?there cannot be?compulsion in the matter. This results from the fact that the Scriptures recognize no higher tribunal than a church. There are many prudential reasons for the formation of associations. Some persons seem to think that the chief business of associations is to collect the statistics of the churches and publish them. This is the least part of their business. Their great work is connected with local Church Extension, the Missionary Enterprise, Bible, Book, and Tract Distribution, Ministerial Education, and the Sunday School work. Combined action for these objects is more effective than isolated action. This is the supreme reason for associations.

It follows, of necessity, that an association is only an advisory body. It may recommend to the churches that they do thus and thus; but it can go no further. It can enact no decrees; and if it did, it would have no power to execute them. It is no Court of Appeals, whose decisions are to nullify those of the churches. Baptists must, with holy jealousy, watch and arrest the first encroachments of associations on the independence of the churches. There needs to be something said about COUNCILS. Like associations, they are advisory bodies; and while this fact is kept distinctly in view, their utility cannot be questioned; but there is danger lest they assume authority over the churches; and lest the churches acquiesce in the assumption. The following remarks on councils, from a judicious author [FOOTNOTE: Rev. Warnam Walker, in his ?Church Discipline,? pp. 63, 64.] are recommended to the Christian brotherhood:

?The true theory of councils appears to be that which regards them as merely advisory. In ordinary cases of discipline, involving no doubtful or difficult question, they are not needed. But cases of a different character may arise. A church may be called to act upon questions of the highest importance, and so complicated and difficult, as to render needful all the wisdom and experience that can be brought to bear upon them. Or, a church may be so divided in opinion on questions seriously affecting its vital interests, that no approach to unanimity can reasonably be hoped for, except through the influence of such a council as may command the respect and confidence of the body. Or, the pastor of a church may be guilty of some misconduct, involving a forfeiture of his ministerial and Christian character. In this last case, although no doubt may be entertained in relation to the course to be pursued, still it is important that the advice of other pastors and able brethren should be obtained. The removal of one of Zion's watchmen is a matter of painful interest, not merely to the one church over which he presides, but to many. As a public teacher of religion, he has had a place in their affectionate regard; and his fall, like the extinction of a star, is felt by them to be a public calamity. It would seem, therefore, in the case supposed, to be due to the neighboring churches, that before any decisive action is had, a council should be called to

deliberate upon the whole matter, and say what action in their judgment is advisable. The opinion of such a body, although not binding upon the church, is entitled to its consideration; and if adopted must add greatly to the weight of its final decision.

?In this, and in all cases, where the aid of a council is sought, the right of a decision rests with the church. It is the province of the council, not to act authoritatively, but to advise the churches how to act. The advice so given ought by no means to be lightly rejected; but if, in the deliberative judgment of the church, it is contrary to the will of the Master, it cannot be adopted. When a disagreement of this kind exists, perhaps the most effective means of restoring harmony may be to have recourse to a second council. Still, the ultimate decision belongs to the church.

?It is supposed by some that the power of ordination to the Christian ministry resides, not in the church, but in a council, assembled at the call of a church, and acting through a presbytery of its own selection. And this being assumed, it is supposed to follow, that the power to depose from the ministry, which is an act of equal authority with the other, must be lodged in a body similarly constituted. But whence, it may be demanded, does the council, as such, derive its origin and its power? Evidently from the church. But for the call of the church it would never have existed. It is the creature of the church, and cannot, without manifest impropriety, exercise an authority superior to that of its creator. Besides?if a church be incompetent to depose from the ministry, it must also be incompetent to exclude a minister, since the former act is virtually included in the latter. The discipline of the church, so far as ministers are concerned, would thus become an empty name. The truth seems to be that the ordinary power is in the church. Inasmuch, however, as the exercise of that power is an act of public importance and interest, it is due to the neighboring churches, that the advice of their pastors and such other members as they may designate for this purpose, should previously be heard. Especially is it due to the presbyters who may be called upon to act, that they should have opportunity to satisfy themselves in relation to the character, call to the ministry, and qualifications of the candidate. For these reasons, a council ought always in such cases to be called, not to ordain, but to advise the church in respect to ordination; nor is it easy to conceive of a case in which it would be expedient for the church to insist upon proceeding, contrary to such advice. Still, the right of decision is in the church; and the officiating presbytery should be regarded as acting, not in behalf of the council, but in behalf of the church.? This long extract has been made, because the views it presents are believed to be of great importance. Councils composed of judicious brethren may be expected to give good advice, and good advice should be taken; but as councils are advisory, they are not authoritative bodies. Hence for a council to require a church to give a pledge beforehand to abide by its decision is a direct assault on church independence. And for a church to give such a pledge is disloyalty to Christ; for it is a surrender of the great principle that a church is the highest tribunal, and is the only competent authority to pronounce a final decision.

02.1. CHAPTER 1. BAPTISTS REGARD THE BAPTISM OF UNCONSCIOUS INFANTS AS UNSCRIPTURAL, ...

CHAPTER 1. BAPTISTS REGARD THE BAPTISM OF UNCONSCIOUS INFANTS AS UNSCRIPTURAL, AND INSIST ON THE BAPTISM OF BELIEVERS IN CHRIST; AND OF BELIEVERS ALONE.

BEFORE showing wherein Baptists differ from other Christian denominations, it may be well for me to say that in many things there is substantial agreement. As to the inspiration, and the consequent infallibility, of the word of God, there is no difference of opinion. The Bible is recognized as the supreme standard of faith and practice that is to say, it teaches us what to believe and what to do.

Salvation by grace is a doctrine which commands the cordial assent of all Christians. While “sin reigns unto death,” they rejoice that “grace reigns through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.” They expect through endless ages to ascribe their salvation to the sovereign grace of God.

Justification by faith in Christ is a fundamental article of belief among all Christians. Acceptance with God on the ground of their works they know to be impossible, and they give the Lord Jesus the trustful reception which the gospel claims for him, and of which his person, character, and mediatorial work render him infinitely worthy. Christ is the object of their faith.

Regeneration by the Holy Spirit is a Christian doctrine. To be “born of the Spirit” is an essential part of salvation; for the subjects of this second birth become the children of God and heirs of heaven. They “put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.” With regard to these and kindred topics Baptists are in accord with other evangelical Christians; but there are points of difference. On these points Baptists hold views which distinguish them from Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Lutherans, Methodists. These views they deem so important as to justify their denominational existence; and because they hold these views they are a people “everywhere spoken against.” If, however, the distinctive principles of Baptists have their foundation in the word of God, they should be not only earnestly espoused, but maintained with unswerving fidelity. No truth taught in the Scriptures can be considered unimportant while the words of Jesus are remembered: “Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven” (Matthew 5:19); “Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you” (Matthew 28:20).

SECTION I. The account given of John’s baptism and of the personal

ministry of Christ affords no justification of infant baptism. In Matthew 3:1-17 it is thus written: “In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, Repent ye:

for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins. But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance: and think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.” From these verses we learn that John preached repentance; that those whom he baptized confessed their sins; and that descent from Abraham was not a qualification for baptism. There is nothing in the narrative that can suggest the idea of the baptism of impenitent adults or of unconscious infants. This is equally true of the account of John’s ministry a given by the other three evangelists.

Paul, in explaining John’s baptism, says, “John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus” (Acts 19:4). Here it is plain that John required in those he baptized repentance and faith. They were not only to repent, but to believe in the coming Christ, for whom it was John’s mission to “prepare a people.” There is not the remotest allusion to the baptism of any who either did not or could not repent and believe in Christ. Baptists, so far as the subjects of baptism are concerned, certainly imitate closely the example of John the Baptist. The disciples of Christ baptized no infants during his ministry. The only reference we have to the baptisms administered by them before the Redeemer’s death and resurrection is in John 3:26; John 4:1-2, as follows: “And they came unto John, and said unto him, Rabbi, lie that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bearest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him;” “When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples.” From the words quoted from the third chapter it would be thought that Jesus baptized personally; but we have an explanation of the matter in the language of the fourth chapter. Baptism was not administered by the Saviour; but, as his apostles acted under his authority, he is represented as doing what they did by his direction. The fact, however, which deserves special notice is “that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John.” There is a distinction between making and baptizing disciples. First in order was the process of discipleship to Christ, and then baptism as a recognition of discipleship. Could unconscious infants be made disciples? Manifestly not. Then, according to this passage, they were not eligible to baptism; for the inference is irresistible that none were baptized who had not first been made disciples. The oft-repeated verse, “Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven,” does not justify infant baptism. For what purpose were these children taken to Christ? That he should baptize them? Evidently not; for he did not baptize. Were they taken to him that his disciples might baptize them? If so, it is marvellous that the disciples rebuked those who had charge of them. The preceding verse shows why these children were taken to Christ: “Then were brought unto him little children, that he should put his hands on them and pray: and the disciples rebuked them” (Matthew 19:13). There was a specific object in view. It was not that the “little children” might be baptized, but that the Saviour might put his hands on them and pray. Who has the right to infer that these children were baptized, or that baptism was mentioned in their presence? The sacred narrative is silent on the subject; and it may be said with positive certainty that the New Testament, from the birth of John the Baptist to the death of Christ, says nothing concerning infant baptism. If, however, Pedobaptists should admit this, they would still insist many of them, at least that there is authority

for their practice bearing date subsequent to the Redeemer's death and resurrection. We shall see whether there is such authority.

SECTION II. The Commission given by the Saviour to his apostles just before

his ascension to heaven furnishes no plea for infant baptism. The circumstances connected with the giving of this Commission were replete with interest. The Lord Jesus had finished the work which he came down from heaven to accomplish. He had offered himself a sacrifice for sin. He had exhausted the cup of atoning sorrow. He had lain in the dark mansions of the grave. He had risen in triumph from the dead, and was about to ascend to the right hand of the Majesty on high. Invested with perfect mediatorial authority, he said to his apostles, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." Mark records the same Commission thus: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Luke's record is this: "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem" (Matthew 28:18-20; Mark 16:15-16; Luke 24:46-47).

Surely the language of this Commission is plain. Matthew informs us that teaching or making disciples; for the Greek verb means "to disciple" or "to make disciples" is to precede baptism, Mark establishes the priority of faith to baptism, and Luke connects repentance and remission of sins with the execution of the Commission. No man can, in obedience to this Commission, baptize either an unbeliever or an infant. The unbeliever is not a penitent disciple, and it is impossible for an infant to repent and believe the gospel.

It may be laid down as a principle of common sense which commends itself to every unprejudiced mind that a commission to do a thing or things authorizes only the doing of the thing or things specified in it. The doing of all other things is virtually forbidden. There is a maxim of law: *Expressio unius est exclusio alterius*. [Note: "The expression of one thing is the exclusion of another."] It must be so; for otherwise there could be no definiteness in contracts between men, and no precision in either the enactments of legislative bodies or in the decrees of courts of justice. This maxim may be illustrated in a thousand ways. Numerous scriptural illustrations are at hand; I will name a few. God commanded Noah to build an ark of gopher-wood. He assigns no reason why gopher-wood should be used. The command, however, is positive, and it forbids the use of any other kind of wood for that purpose. Abraham was commanded to offer his son Isaac for a burnt-offering. He was virtually forbidden to offer any other member of his family. Ay, more, he could not offer an animal till the original order was revoked by him who gave it, and a second order was given requiring the sacrifice of a ram in the place of Isaac. The institution of the passover furnishes a striking illustration, or rather a series of illustrations. A lamb was to be killed not a heifer; it was to be of the first year not of the second or third; a male not a female; without blemish not with blemish; on the fourteenth day of the month not on some other day; the blood to be applied to the door-posts and lintels not elsewhere. These illustrations are all scriptural, but I may refer also to the Constitution of the United States. It says of the President: "He shall have power,

by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the senators present concur." This language in effect forbids the making of a treaty by the President alone, or by the President and the House of Representatives in Congress, or by the President and the Supreme Court. It pronounces invalid a treaty made by the President and a majority of "senators present," for there must be "two-thirds." The Constitution declares that the House of Representatives "shall have the sole power of impeachment," and the Senate "shall have the sole power to try all impeachments." Here the Senate is as effectually inhibited from the "power of impeachment" as is the House of Representatives from the power of trying "impeachments." Neither the President, the Supreme Court, nor the Senate can impeach, but the House of Representatives alone. The President, the Supreme Court, and the House of Representatives combined cannot "try impeachments," but the Senate alone. In application of the principle laid down and of the law-maxim illustrated, I affirm that the Commission of Christ to the apostles, in requiring them to baptize disciples believers forbids, in effect, the baptism of all others. It will not do to say that we are not forbidden in so many words to baptize infants. The same may be said of unbelievers, and even of horses and sheep and bells. This examination of the Commission fully authorizes me to say that it furnishes no plea for infant baptism. But it will be said for it has been said a thousand times that if infants are not to be baptized because they cannot believe, they cannot, for the same reason, be saved. If the salvation of infants depends on their faith, they cannot be saved. They are incapable of faith. They are doubtless saved through the mediation of Jesus Christ, but it is not by faith. The opponents of Baptists signally fail to accomplish their purpose in urging this objection to our views. They intend to make us concede the propriety of infant baptism or force us to a denial of infant salvation. But we make neither the concession nor the denial. As soon as we say that infants are not saved by faith, but without faith, their objection is met and demolished.

SECTION III There is no instance of infant baptism on the day of Pentecost,

nor in Samaria under the preaching of Philip. The day of Pentecost was a memorable day. Forty days after his resurrection Jesus had ascended to heaven. Before his ascension, however, he gave his apostles express command to tarry at Jerusalem till endued with power from on high. This power was received, in connection with their baptism in the Holy Spirit, on the day of Pentecost. They were copiously imbued with the Spirit placed more fully under his influence than ever before. All things whatsoever Jesus had said to them were brought to their remembrance. They were required for the first time to show their understanding of the Commission of their ascended Lord. How did they understand it? How did they execute it? First, the gospel was preached. Peter in his great sermon proved Jesus to be the Christ, and derived his proof from the Old Testament Scriptures. Then he charged his hearers with the crime of crucifying the Lord of glory. The people were pierced to the heart, and said, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" It was an important question, asked for the first time after the apostles received their worldwide Commission. The answer is in these words: "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call" (Acts 2:38-39). No one says that the command "Repent" is applicable to infants, and it is certain that the injunction "Be baptized" has no reference to them; for it is as clear as the sun in heaven that the same persons are commanded to repent

and be baptized. Then too it ought to be remembered that it would not be rational to address a command to unconscious infants. It is supposed by some, however, that the words "the promise is to you and to your children" refer to infants. The term "children," however, evidently means "posterity;" and the promise cannot be divested of its relation to the Holy Spirit. This promise was not only to the Jews and their posterity, but to Gentiles. The latter are referred to in the words "to all that are afar off." This restriction is laid upon the promise "Even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Whether the word "call" is used in its general sense, as in Proverbs 8:4, "Unto you, O men, I call," or in its special sense, as in 1 Corinthians 1:24, "But unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks," it is in either case inapplicable to infants. Did any obey Peter's command "Be baptized"? It is written, "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls" (Acts 2:41). The baptism was limited to those who gladly received Peter's word; and, as infants were not of that number, to infer that they were baptized is utterly gratuitous. There is nothing in the Pentecostal administration of baptism which intimates that infants were considered proper subjects of the ordinance. Let it not be forgotten that the converts on the day of Pentecost were the first persons baptized under the Apostolic Commission, and therefore we have in their baptism the first practical exposition of its true meaning.

There is nothing like infant baptism in the account given of Philip's labors in Samaria. The reader can examine for himself the eighth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. There it will be seen that Philip began to execute the Commission by preaching: he "preached Christ unto them." He doubtless remembered the words of the risen Redeemer: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." The Samaritans "believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ;" and what then? It is said, "They were baptized, both men and women." Here the Commission of Christ was practically expounded. Is there anything in the exposition which can suggest the idea of "infant dedication to God in baptism"? Surely not. Philip's plan of operation was evidently uniform. Hence, when he fell in with the Ethiopian eunuch as we learn from the latter part of the same chapter he first "preached unto him Jesus." The eunuch professed faith in the Messiah. Then Philip baptized him. As "faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Romans 10:17), there must be preaching before faith, and there must be faith before baptism, because this is the order established by Christ in the Great Commission. Alas for those who invert this order!

SECTION IV. The argument from household baptisms in favor of infant baptism is invalid.

I will refer to these baptisms as they are recorded in the Scriptures. In Acts 10:1-48 there is an account of Peter's visit to Cornelius. He began at Caesarea to preach to Gentiles as he had before preached to Jews. He carried into effect the Great Commission in precisely the same way. The Holy Spirit accompanied the word preached, and Gentile believers for the first time "spoke with tongues and magnified God." Then said Peter, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Here was a household baptism, but there are things said of the subjects of this baptism, that could not be true of speechless infants. One fact, however, settles the whole matter. In the second verse of the chapter it is said that Cornelius "feared God with all his house." Can infants fear God? The baptism of Lydia and her household at Philippi is next in

order. The narrative, as given in Acts 16:13-15, is as follows: "And on the sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither. And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God, heard us: whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul. And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house and abide there. And she constrained us." No one denies that Lydia was a believer; she was therefore a proper subject of baptism. But it is inferred by Pedobaptists that, as her household was baptized, infants must have been baptized. This does not follow, for the very good reason that there are many households in which there are no infants. The probability and it amounts almost to a certainty is that Lydia had neither husband nor children. She was engaged in secular business was "a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira," which was a considerable distance from Philippi. If she had a husband and infant children, is it not reasonable to suppose that her husband would have taken on himself the business in which she was engaged, letting her remain at home with the infant children? She evidently had no husband with her; for we cannot believe that she violated conjugal propriety so far as to reduce her husband to a cipher by saying "my house." Nor can we believe that the sacred historian would have spoken of "the house of Lydia" in Acts 16:40, if she had a husband. The most reasonable inference is that her household consisted of persons in her employ, that they as well as Lydia became Christian converts, and that they were the "brethren" whom Paul and Silas "comforted" when, having been released from prison, they "entered into the house of Lydia." Enough has been said to invalidate Pedobaptist objections to the Baptist explanation of this narrative, and nothing more can be required. Pedobaptists affirm that Lydia had infant children. Their argument rests for its basis on this view. On them devolves the burden of proof. They must prove that she had infant children. This they have never done this they can never do. The narrative therefore furnishes no argument in favor of infant baptism. The same chapter (Acts 16:1-40) contains an account of the baptism of the jailer and his household. Here it is necessary to say but little; for everyone can see that there were no infants in the jailer's family. Paul and Silas "spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house" It is also said that the jailer rejoiced, "believing in God with all his house." Surely the word of the Lord was not spoken to infants; surely infants are incapable of believing. It is worthy of notice that this record shows how Paul understood the Commission of Christ. He first spoke the word of the Lord, and when that word was believed, but not till then, was there an administration of baptism.

It is only necessary to refer to the household of Crispus (Acts 18:8) to show what has just been shown namely, that a man's house as well as himself may believe on the Lord. It is not said in so many words that the family of Crispus was baptized, but it is said that he "believed on the Lord with all his house." No doubt the family was baptized, but faith in Christ preceded the baptism. In 1 Corinthians 1:16, Paul says, "And I baptized also the household of Stephanas." Will anyone infer that there were infants in this family? This inference cannot be drawn, in view of what the same apostle says in the same Epistle (1 Corinthians 16:15): "Ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the first-fruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints." Infants could not addict themselves to the ministry of the saints. It follows that there were no infants in the family of Stephanas. I am aware that to invalidate this conclusion an argument from chronology has been used. It has been urged that, although infants were baptized in the family of Stephanas when Paul planted the church at Corinth, sufficient time elapsed between their baptism

and the date of Paul's First Epistle to the church to justify the declaration, "They have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints." This argument avails nothing in view of the fact that the most liberal chronology allows only a few years to have intervened between the planting of the church and the date of the Epistle.

Reference has now been made to all the household baptisms mentioned in the New Testament, and there is no proof that there was an infant in any of them. On the other hand, facts and circumstances are related which render it a moral certainty that there were no infants in those baptized families. It will not do to say that ordinarily there are infants in households; it must be shown that it is universal in the case. Then the household argument will avail Pedobaptists not till then. But it cannot be said of all households that there are infants in them. Many a Baptist minister in the United States has baptized more households than are referred to in the New Testament, and no infants in them. It is said that more than thirty entire household baptisms have occurred in connection with American Baptist missionary operations among the Karens in Burraah. In view of such considerations as have now been presented, the reasonings of Pedobaptists from household baptisms are utterly inconclusive. They cannot satisfy a logical mind.

SECTION V.

Certain passages in the New Testament supposed by some

Pedobaptists to refer to infant baptism shown to have no such reference.

Conspicuous among these passages is what Paul says in Romans 11 : of the "good olive tree" and of the "wild olive tree." It is assumed that by the "good olive tree" is meant the "Jewish church-state." This assumption requires another namely, that the "wild olive tree" denotes a Gentile church-state; but from the latter view the most earnest Pedobaptist recoils. The truth is there is no reference by the apostle to any "church-state," whether among Jews or Gentiles. Paul teaches in substance what we learn from other parts of the New Testament that the Jews enjoyed great privileges, which they abused; in consequence of which abuse, the privileges were taken from them and given to the Gentiles. This is the teaching of Christ; for he said to the Jews, "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" (Matthew 21:43).

Why this, kingdom was taken from the Jews we may learn from John 1:11 : "He came unto his own, and his own received him not." They rejected the Messiah who came in fulfilment of their own prophecies, and thus they surrendered the vantage-ground which they had occupied for centuries; and the blessings of the gospel which they refused to accept were offered to, and accepted by, the Gentiles. In this way what Paul elsewhere calls "the blessing of Abraham" was seen to "come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ" (Galatians 3:14). The promise of the Spirit was received through faith; for it was by faith that the Gentiles were brought into union with Christ. We see, therefore, the force of Paul's language addressed to a Gentile believer in Romans 11:19-20 : "Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off that I might be grafted in. Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith." The reference to faith shows that there is no allusion to infants, who cannot believe. So it appears that the imagery of "the olive tree" affords neither aid nor comfort to the cause of infant baptism.

Pedobaptists appeal with great confidence to 1 Corinthians 7:14 in support of their views. The words are these: "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy." It will be seen on examination that there is not in this language the remotest reference to infant baptism. What are the facts in the case? Simply these: The question was agitated at Corinth whether believing husbands and wives should not separate themselves from their unbelieving partners. The idea was entertained by some, at least that an unbeliever was "unclean" to a believer, even as, under the Mosaic dispensation, a Gentile was "unclean" to a Jew, Paul corrects this false impression by showing that the unbelieving husband is sanctified or, rather, has been sanctified by the wife. The perfect tense is used a fact ignored by Drs. Conant and Davidson in their revisions, but fully recognized by Dr. Noyes. Without entering into a critical discussion of the word "sanctified," I avail myself of the fact that the sanctification was such as to justify the continuance of the marriage-relation between the believing and the unbelieving partner: "else" that is, if the sanctification did not remove the supposed "uncleanness" from unbelieving parents "were your children unclean, but now are they holy." As the verb translated "were" is in the present tense, it should be rendered "are:" "else your children are unclean, but now are they holy." The pronoun "your" deserves special notice. The apostle does not say their children that is, the children of the believing and the unbelieving partner but your children, the children of the parents who were members of the Corinthian church. It follows that the passage under review is intensely strong against infant baptism. It shows that the children of the members of the church sustained the same relation to the church that unbelieving husbands and wives did, and that if believing husbands and wives abandoned their unbelieving partners, then believing parents might, with the same propriety, separate themselves from their children.

Perhaps the exposition of this passage given by a well-known Pedobaptist will be more satisfactory than mine. Rev. Albert Barnes says: "There is not one word about baptism here; not one allusion to it; nor does the argument in the remotest degree bear upon it. The question was not whether children should be baptized, but it was whether there should be a separation between man and wife where the one was a Christian and the other not. Paul states that if such a separation should take place, it would imply that the marriage was improper; and of course the children must be regarded as unclean." [Note: Barnes's Notes on First Corinthians, p. 133.]

Thus it appears that this passage so often made the basis of Pedobaptist argument affords no support to the theory or the practice of infant baptism.

SECTION VI. The allusions to baptism in the Apostolic Epistles

forbid the supposition that infants were baptized.

Paul refers to the baptized as "dead to sin," or, rather, as having "died to sin." He asks, "How shall we, that are dead to sin [that died, to sin], live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" (Romans 6:2-3). What is meant by dying to sin cannot be exemplified in unconscious infants. In 1 Corinthians 15:29 we have these words: "Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for the dead?" The controverted phrase "baptized for the dead," occurring, as it does, in the midst of an argument on the resurrection, most probably means "baptized in the belief of the resurrection." Such a belief cannot be predicated of infants. In Galatians 3:27 it is written,

“For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.” These words cannot apply to infants, because they are incapable of putting on Christ. In Colossians 2:12 the record is, “Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.” However true and consoling may be the doctrine of infant salvation, it is not true that infants are risen with Christ “through the faith of the operation of God.” If, in 1 Timothy 6:12, the language, “hast professed a good profession before many witnesses,” refers to the baptismal profession, it is evident that such a profession cannot be made by those in a state of infancy. Dr. Davidson translates “didst confess the good confession before many witnesses,” which is strictly literal, for the Greek verb refers to past time. In Hebrews 10:22 we find the expression “our bodies washed with pure water.” If there is in these words an allusion to baptism (and I think there is), it is plain that the same persons who were baptized had been set free from “an evil conscience.” No infant has “an evil conscience.”

Peter, in his First Epistle (1 Peter 3:21), defines baptism to be “the answer of a good conscience toward God by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.” This is a general definition, and it forbids the idea that baptism, in apostolic times, was administered to any but accountable agents. What conscience has an infant? There is no operation of conscience before accountability. Baptism, then, in its administration to infants, cannot be what Peter says it is. This is for Pedobaptists an unfortunate fact a fact which shows their practice to be unscriptural.

There is in this connection another thing worthy of consideration. Paul, in his Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, exhorts children to obey their parents. It is generally supposed that about five years intervened between the introduction of the gospel into Ephesus and Colosse and the writing of Paul’s Epistles. Now, if those children, or any of them, had been baptized when the gospel was introduced into these cities, is it not strange that the apostle, in urging upon them obedience, presented no motive derived from their dedication to God in baptism? There is no allusion to any “vows, promises, and obligations” made and assumed for them by their parents or sponsors at their baptism. There is nothing said that bears a resemblance to a personal acceptance of a draft drawn upon them in anticipation of their intelligence and responsibility. Here a query may be presented: Would a Pedobaptist apostle have pursued this course? To bring the matter nearer home: Would a Pedobaptist missionary write a letter to a Pedobaptist church, making special mention of parents and children, urging both to a faithful performance of relative duties, and say nothing about the obligations of either parents or children as connected with infant baptism or growing out of it? No one will answer this question affirmatively. The apostle of the Gentiles, therefore, did what we cannot reasonably imagine a Pedobaptist missionary or minister to do. This is a very suggestive fact.

I have now noticed the usual arguments supposed to be furnished by the New Testament in favor of infant baptism. Not one has been intentionally omitted. Is there precept or example to justify it? Celebrated Pedobaptist authors shall answer this question. Dr. Wall of the Church of England, in his History of Infant Baptism, on the very first page of his “Preface,” says that, “among all the persons that are recorded as baptized by the apostles, there is no express mention of any infant.” Neander of Germany the first church historian of his generation referring to “the latter part of the apostolic age,” expresses himself thus: “As baptism was closely united with a conscious entrance on Christian communion, faith and baptism were always connected with one another; and thus it is in the highest degree probable that baptism was performed only in instances where both could

meet together, and that the practice of infant baptism was unknown at this period. We cannot infer the existence of infant baptism from the instance of the baptism of whole families, for the passage in 1 Corinthians 16:15 shows the fallacy of such a conclusion, as from that it appears that the whole family of Stephanas, who were baptized by Paul, consisted of adults.” [Note: Planting and Training of the Church, pp. 101, 102] Professor Moses Stuart, for many years the glory of the Andover Theological Seminary, in his Essay on Baptism (p. 101), says, in his reference to infant baptism, “Commands or plain and certain examples, in the New Testament, relative to it, I do not find. Nor, with my views of it, do I need them.” Dr. Woods, long a colleague of Professor Stuart, in his Lectures on Infant Baptism, remarks as follows: “It is a plain case that there is no express precept respecting infant baptism in our sacred writings. The proof, then, that infant baptism is a divine institution must be made out in another way.” These are important concessions, made by men whose celebrity is coextensive with Christendom.

Now, if the New Testament does not sustain the cause of infant baptism, ought it not to be given up? If, as the Westminster Confession affirms, “baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ,” it is self-evident that we should go to the New Testament to learn who are proper subjects of baptism. If it was ordained by Jesus Christ, we should allow him to decide who are to be baptized, and not refer the matter to either Abraham or Moses. But Pedobaptists, unable to prove infant baptism from the New Testament, go to the Old, and try to sustain it by reasoning, analogy, inference. Was there ever before such a course adopted to establish a divine ordinance? Ask a Jew why his ancestors for so many centuries observed the feasts of the Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles, and he will tell you that God commanded them to do so. Ask a Christian why believers should be baptized and partake of the Lord’s Supper, and his response will be that these are injunctions of Jesus Christ. Ask a Pedobaptist, however, why infants should be baptized, and he will at once plunge into the mazes of Judaism and argue the identity of the old “Jewish Church” and the gospel church, insisting, meanwhile, on the substitution of baptism for circumcision. This is a strange method of proving that infants ought to be baptized. It argues a consciousness of the utter absence of New Testament authority for infant baptism. It indicates that there is no command to baptize infants; for a command would supersede the necessity of argument to show the propriety of the practice. No man enters into an argument to prove that believers should be baptized. The positive injunction of Christ renders it superfluous. Strange as it is for Pedobaptists to go to the Old Testament for justification of one of their practices under the New Testament economy, yet, as they do so, it is necessary to follow them. This will now be done.

SECTION VII. The argument from the supposed identity of the Jewish

commonwealth and the gospel church of no force. This identity is assumed, and on it the propriety of infant church-membership is thought to rest. I shall permit distinguished Pedobaptist writers representative men to speak for themselves. Dr. Hibbard, a very able Methodist author, in his work on Christian Baptism, says: “Our next proper position relates to the substantial oneness or identity of the Jewish and Christian churches. I say substantial oneness, because, although in many secondary and adventitious points they differ, still, in all the essential features if the real church of God, they are one and the same. And here it is proper to admonish the reader of the importance of this position. It is upon this ground that we rest the weight of the Bible argument for infant baptism” (pp. 31, 32). This language is plain and easily understood, though anyone familiar with the

baptismal controversy will detect in the phrase “substantial oneness” an unwillingness to endorse the “identity” theory without qualification.

Dr. Samuel Miller, for many years Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Princeton Theological Seminary, in his *Sermons on Baptism*, expresses himself thus: “As the infant seed of the people of God are acknowledged on all hands to have been members of the church equally with their parents under the Old Testament Dispensation, so it is equally certain that the church of God is the same in substance now that it was then.” The italics are the Doctor’s. Here, also, is a disposition to recoil from a bold avowal of the doctrine of identity. “The same in substance” is the convenient phrase selected to meet the logical exigences that may possibly occur. Again, Dr. Miller says: “It is not more certain that a man arrived at mature age is the same individual that he was when an infant on his mother’s lap, than it is that the church, in the plenitude of her light and privileges after the coming of Christ, is the same church which many centuries before, though with a much smaller amount of light and privilege, yet; as we are expressly told in the New Testament (Acts 7:38), enjoyed the presence and guidance of her Divine Head in the wilderness.” [Note: *Sermons on Baptism*, pp. 18, 19.]

Dr. N. L. Rice, in his debate with the renowned Alexander Campbell at Lexington, Kentucky, remarks, “The church, then, is the same under the Jewish and Christian Dispensations the same into which God did, by positive law, put believers and their children” [Note: *Debate*, p. 285] Dr. Rice, it will be seen, is bolder than Drs. Hibbard and Miller. He says nothing about “substantial oneness,” “the same in substance;” but with characteristic fearlessness announces his position, and, in order to attract special attention, italicizes the words in which he expresses it. The venerable Dr. Charles Hodge, in his *Theology*, is as positive in his statements as is Dr. Rice. This will be seen in the following extracts: “The commonwealth of Israel was the church. It is so called in Scripture (Acts 7:38);” “The church under the New Dispensation is identical with that under the Old. It is not a new church, but one and the same under the old economy, the church and state were identical. No man could be a member of the one without being a member of the other. Exclusion from the one was exclusion from the other. In the pure theocracy the high priest was the head of the state as well as the head of the church. The priests and Levites were civil as well as religious officers” (vol. 3, pp. 548, 549, 552, 553). As Dr. Hodge held these views, the thoughtful reader will wonder that he was not an advocate of a union between church and state under the gospel economy. That he was not resulted from a fortunate inconsistency on his part. The Pedobaptist view of the identity of the Jewish theocracy and the Christian Church is now before us as given by men of high position and distinction. Can this view be sustained? I shall attempt to show that it is utterly untenable. First, however, the term church must be defined. It means “a congregation,” “an assembly.” The Greeks used the term *ekklesia* (the word translated “church”) to signify an assembly, without regard to the purpose for which the assembly met. Hence the tumultuous concourse of the citizens of Ephesus referred to in Acts 19:32; Acts 19:41, is called in the original *ekklesia*, and is translated “assembly.” We have the same word in verse 39; but, as a defining epithet is prefixed to it, we read in the common version “lawful assembly.” The term *ekklesia*, therefore, while it denotes an assembly, does not, in its general signification, denote the kind of assembly. This being the case, the Jewish nation, or congregation, might with propriety be called *ekklesia*, or “church,” as in Acts 7:38. In the New Testament, however, the term *ekklesia*, in its application to the followers of Christ, generally refers to a particular local congregation of saints.

I do not say that it has not a more extensive meaning, but this is its general meaning; and with this alone the present argument is concerned. The sacred writers speak of the churches of Judea, the churches of Macedonia, the churches of Asia, the churches of Galatia; and these churches were evidently composed of persons who had made credible profession of their faith in Christ. In apostolic times the members of a particular congregation were called "saints," "believers," "disciples," "brethren." They were separated from the world a spiritual people. Baptists say that in this sense of the term "church" there was no church before the Christian Dispensation. There were doubtless many pious persons from the days of Abel to the coming of Christ, but there was not a body of saints separate from the world. The Jewish nation was separate from other nations, but it was not a nation of saints. It was a kind of politico religious body, and circumcision was a mark of nationality. The righteous and the wicked belonged to this commonwealth and were entitled to its privileges. But there was no spiritual organization composed of regenerate persons, called out, separated, from the Jews as a people, till John the Baptist came preaching in the wilderness of Judea. I have been thus particular in defining the term "church" that there may be no misapprehension of its meaning. Where the phrase "Jewish Church" is used it is to be understood as denoting as in Acts 7:38 the whole nation, and not a true spiritual body. But where the phrase "Christian Church" occurs it denotes a body of regenerate, spiritual believers in Christ.

I now proceed to show that the Jewish theocracy and the kingdom of God, or of heaven, as referred to in the New Testament, are not identical.

1. Because, when the Jewish theocracy had been in existence for centuries, the prophets predicted the establishment of a new kingdom. In Isaiah 2:2 it is written, "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it." There is manifest reference here to the kingdom of God. It is not intimated that this kingdom had been established, but that it was to be established. The phrase "last days" means, no doubt, what it means in Hebrews 1:1-2 : "God, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son." It designates the period of the Christian Dispensation. The prophecy of Daniel (Daniel 2:44) deserves special consideration. Having referred, in the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, to the empires of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome, the prophet added, "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." This kingdom was to be set up several centuries after Daniel prophesied. The phrase "set up" must indicate the establishment of a new kingdom; there is no intimation that the old Jewish kingdom was to be reorganized. This new kingdom was to stand forever. It was not to fall, like the worldly empires symbolized by the gold, silver, brass, and iron of Nebuchadnezzar's image, but it was to be a permanent kingdom, maintaining an unbroken existence amid the lapse of ages and the revolutions of time. Who does not see that this kingdom has an inseparable connection with the church of Christ, of which he said, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it"? (Matthew 16:18). The kingdom, the church; is to stand. Why? Because the machinations of Satan cannot overthrow it.

John the Baptist referred in his preaching to the new kingdom. His voice was heard in the wilderness of Judea, saying, "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matthew 3:2). Was it the old Jewish kingdom that was at hand? Certainly not. Jesus too, in the very beginning of

his ministry, announced the same kingdom as “at hand.” He said, “The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel” (Mark 1:15). The time to which the prophets, Daniel especially, referred was fulfilled. The new kingdom was at hand. The command, therefore, was “Repent ye.” Such preaching had never before been heard. The injunction “Repent” was new, and the argument enforcing it was new. There was something so novel and so distinctive in the preaching of Christ and his harbinger as to indicate the introduction of a new era. That the preaching of John was the beginning of a new era is manifest from the Saviour’s words: “The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it” (Luke 16:16). In view of the considerations now presented, how can the Jewish theocracy and the gospel kingdom be the same? Is “the substantial oneness, or identity, of the Jewish and Christian churches” to use Dr. Hibbard’s words a possible thing? Yet he says, “It is upon this ground that we rest the weight of the Bible argument for infant baptism.” It rests, then, on a foundation of sand. Dr. Hibbard is in a dilemma. He may choose either horn of this dilemma, and it will gore him unmercifully. For if such a foundation can sustain the argument for infant baptism, there is no weight in the argument; but if the weight of the argument crushes the foundation, there is no solidity in the foundation.

2. Another fact fatal to the identity contended for is that those who were regular members of the old Jewish Church could not become members of the Christian Church without repentance, faith, regeneration, and baptism. The plain-ness of this proposition renders it needless to dwell upon it at any great length. A few considerations will sufficiently develop its truth. The inhabitants of Judea were, of course, members of the “Jewish Church.” I prefer the phrase “Jewish commonwealth” or “Jewish theocracy,” because in our ordinary language the word “church” carries with it the Christian idea of a truly spiritual body; but through courtesy I say “Jewish Church,” as explained above. The Jews in Jerusalem and in the land of Judea were members of this church. John the Baptist called on these church-members to repent and do works meet for repentance and to believe on the coming Messiah as preparatory to baptism. He restricted the administration of baptism to those who repented and believed. The Pharisees and Sadducees two prominent sects among the Jews were church members. John spoke to them as a “generation of vipers.” The Pharisees had no adequate conception of the necessity of a proper state of heart, and the Sadducees were semi-infidels. They were no doubt recognized as worthy members of the Jewish Church, but they were utterly unfit for membership in a church of Christ. John let them know that their relationship to Abraham was no qualification for a place in the kingdom of heaven. Nicodemus was a Pharisee and an official member of this Jewish Church; yet he was ignorant of the doctrine of regeneration. Being “born again” was a mystery to him. He was an unregenerate man. The Saviour said to him, “Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again” (John 3:7). Nor did Jesus regard any of the Jews as qualified for baptism till they became his disciples. It is therefore said that he “made and baptized more disciples than John” (John 4:1). The scribes, lawyers, and doctors of the Jewish Church the Great Teacher denounced as hypocrites; “for,” he said, “ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in” (Matthew 23:13). This passage proves two things that the kingdom of heaven was then in existence, and that it was not identical with the Jewish kingdom. If it had not been in existence, it could not have been shut up. If it was identical with the Jewish kingdom, the scribes were already in it. But they were not in it; for the Saviour said, “.Ye neither go in yourselves” If, then, they were in the Jewish kingdom, and were not in the kingdom of heaven,

the two kingdoms cannot be the same.

3. It deserves special notice that the covenant of the Jewish Church and the covenant of the Christian Church are different. The truth of this proposition Pedobaptists deny. They assume that “the covenant of grace,” or “gospel covenant,” was made with Abraham, and that the “covenant of circumcision” was so identified with it that circumcision became the seal of “the covenant of grace.”

Dr. Thomas O. Summers, now (1882) Professor of Theology in Vanderbilt University, in his volume on Baptism (p. 23), referring to infants, says: “They are specifically embraced in the gospel covenant. When that covenant was made with Abraham, his children were brought under its provisions, and the same seal that was administered to him was administered also to them, including both those that were born in his house and those that were bought with his money. They were all alike circumcised in token of their common interest in that covenant of which circumcision was the appointed symbol. That covenant is still in force.”

Dr. Hodge, as already quoted, not only says that “the church under the New Dispensation is identical with that under the Old” but adds, “It is founded on the same covenant the covenant made with Abraham.” Again he says: “Such being the nature of the covenant made with Abraham, it is plain that, so far as its main element is concerned, it is still in force. It is the covenant of grace, under which we now live, and upon which the church is now founded” (vol. 3, pp. 549, 550).

Here it is assumed by these two able writers, who worthily represent Methodists and Presbyterians, that the gospel covenant was made with Abraham, and that circumcision was its seal. Pedobaptists have a decided preference for the singular number. They do not say covenants: it is covenant in conversation, in books, and in sermons. Paul speaks of covenants, the two covenants, covenants of promise, etc. How “the covenant of circumcision” can be identified with “the covenant of grace,” or “gospel covenant,” defies ordinary comprehension. Placing myself in antagonism with Drs. Summers and Hodge, I am obliged to say that what the former calls the “gospel covenant” and the latter “the covenant of grace,” was not made with Abraham, They both quote Paul, but Paul does not say so. The language of the apostle is this: “And this I say, That the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ [that is, in reference to the Messiah] the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect” (Galatians 3:17). This covenant was confirmed to Abraham, not made with him. It was made before. It must have had an existence, or it could not have been confirmed. The confirmation of anything implies its previous existence.

I shall not attempt to penetrate the counsels of eternity to ascertain the particulars of the origin of the covenant of grace. It is sufficient for my present purpose to say that it is, doubtless, the result of the sublime consultation of the three Persons in the Godhead concerning the prospective condemnation and ruin of the race of Adam. The first intimation of the existence of this covenant was given in the memorable words, “And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel” (Genesis 3:15). This incipient development of God’s purpose of mercy to man no doubt cheered Abel, Enoch, and all the pious who lived in the world’s infancy. The nature of the covenant, recognized when mercy’s faint whisperings were first heard, was more fully unfolded when that covenant was confirmed to Abraham in the words, “And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed;” “And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed” (Genesis 12:3; Genesis 22:18). These two

promises are substantially the same, the one affirming that in Abraham, the other that in his seed, all the families, or nations, of the earth should be blessed. There was to be no blessing from him personally to all nations, but the blessing was to come through his seed. Irrespective of the provisions of the covenant confirmed to Abraham, there never has been, and never will be, salvation for Jew or Gentile. There is no salvation except in Christ, and Paul informs us that he is referred to as the “seed” of Abraham: “He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ” (Galatians 3:16). The covenant with respect to Christ, if we count from the first promise to Abraham, was confirmed to him when seventy-five years old (Genesis 12:1-20), and the covenant of circumcision was made with him when he had reached his ninety ninth year (Genesis 17:1-27). Twenty-four years intervened between the two transactions, yet Pedobaptists insist that there was but one covenant. One covenant was confirmed to Abraham, and one made with him; .yet, it seems, there was but one! There is some mistake about this, for two ones added together make two.

Now, if, according to the theory of Drs. Summers and Hodge, the “gospel covenant,” or “covenant of grace,” was made with Abraham, and if circumcision was the seal of that covenant, then it had no seal for twenty-four years after it was made. Moreover, if the “gospel covenant,” or “covenant of grace,” was made with Abraham, by the provisions of what covenant were Abel, Enoch, Noah, and others who lived before the days of Abraham, saved? This question is submitted to all the Pedobaptist theologians in Christendom. If they will only consider it, they will cease to say that the “gospel covenant,” or “covenant of grace,” was made with Abraham. If, as Pedobaptists assert, circumcision was the seal of the “covenant of grace,” what became of Abraham’s female descendants? Were the blessings of the covenant not secured to them, or were they left to the “uncovenanted mercies” of God? The truth is the inspired writers never refer to circumcision or baptism as a “seal” of a covenant. Circumcision is called “a token of the covenant” which God made with Abraham (Genesis 17:11) and “a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised” (Romans 4:11). It was never a seal of the righteousness .of the faith of any other man. How could it be, when all Abraham’s male descendants were required to be circumcised at eight days old, when they were incapable of faith? Under the Gospel Dispensation baptism is not a seal, and Pedobaptists labor under a mistake when they so represent it. Believers are “sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise” (Ephesians 1:13). They are commanded to “grieve not the Holy Spirit of God whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption” (Ephesians 4:30). But, for argument’s sake, let baptism be considered a seal a seal of the covenant which, it is said, was formerly sealed by circumcision. Then the perplexing question arises, Why apply the seal to both sexes, when the seal of circumcision was applied to but one? Circumcision, it is argued, was a type of baptism. The type had reference to males alone. Therefore the antitype has reference to both sexes! Such reasoning is at war with the plainest principles of sound logic. There is another absurdity in making baptism the antitype of circumcision. Baptism is referred to by Peter as a “figure.” If, then, circumcision was a type of it, it was a type of a type, a figure of a figure which is incredible. But to be more specific with regard to the covenants: The covenant of circumcision made with Abraham received its full development in the covenant of Mount Sinai, There was, if the expression is allowable, a new edition of the covenant. The Sinaitic regulations were made in pursuance of the provisions of the covenant made with Abraham, and on this account circumcision, the “token of the covenant,” was incorporated into those regulations, and became a rite of the Mosaic economy. Jesus therefore said to the Jews, “If a man on the sabbath day receive

circumcision that the law of Moses should not be broken,” etc. (John 7:23). This language shows that the covenant of circumcision was so identified with the Sinaitic covenant that the failure to circumcise a man was a violation of the law of Moses. The old Jewish Church, then, grew out of the covenant of circumcision, which was the germ of the Sinaitic covenant that God made with the Israelites when he “took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt” (Hebrews 8:9). This covenant, entered into at Mount Sinai, was to continue in force, and did continue in force, till superseded by another and a “better covenant.” It preserved the nationality of the Jews, while circumcision marked that nationality and indicated a natural relationship to Abraham. This celebrated patriarch was to have a numerous natural seed, to which reference is made in the covenant of circumcision, and, by virtue of the provisions of the covenant “confirmed” to him concerning the Messiah, he was to have a spiritual seed also. He was to be the father of believers. Hence we have such passages of Scripture as these: “That he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised” (Romans 4:2); “They which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.” “And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise” (Galatians 3:7; Galatians 3:29). The process of spiritual filiation to Abraham is effected by faith. Jews, therefore his natural seed cannot become his spiritual seed without faith. But if faith creates the spiritual relationship to Abraham, Gentiles as well as Jews may become his spiritual seed, for they are equally capable of faith. For the encouragement of Gentiles who were uncircumcised, Paul referred to the fact that Abraham was justified by faith before he was circumcised. Having referred to the development of the Abrahamic covenant of circumcision in the covenant of Sinai, I may now refer to the development of the covenant respecting the Messiah, out of which covenant has grown the gospel church. This is termed the new covenant, in contradistinction from the Sinaitic covenant. The development of its provisions was to occur many centuries subsequent to the giving of the law, although those provisions had an embryo existence in the covenant “confirmed” to Abraham concerning Christ. In Hebrews 8:8-12 there is a quotation from Jeremiah 31:31-34 which sheds much light on the two covenants. It is as follows: “Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.” This is the new covenant new in its manifestation, though old in its origin the “better covenant, which was established upon better promises” (Hebrews 8:6). Of this covenant Jesus is Mediator, and this fact shows that the gospel covenant is the outgrowth of the covenant “confirmed of God” to Abraham concerning Christ. How essentially different the old covenant and the new! Pedobaptists, however, as we have seen, insist that the Jewish Church and the Christian Church are the same! God found fault with the old covenant, and superseded it by the new; yet it seems that the new which displaces the old is substantially identical with it! It is strange that men do not observe that God, in describing the new covenant, says expressly, “NOT ACCORDING TO THE COVENANT THAT I MADE WITH THEIR FATHERS,” the old covenant.

Several distinctive points of difference between the old covenant and the new may be seen in Galatians 4:22-31. There are four allegorical personages referred to by Paul namely, Hagar, Ishmael, Sarah, and Isaac. Hagar was a "bondmaid," and gave birth to a son "after the flesh" that is, there was in his birth no departure from the laws of ordinary generation. This "bondwoman" represents the covenant of Sinai, and "answereth to Jerusalem, which now is" the old Jewish Church, which "gendereth to bondage." Jerusalem the Jewish Church is therefore said to be "in bondage with her children." To "gender to bondage" was all that Sinai could do; there was no provision in the Sinaitic covenant for anything more: its possibilities were exhausted. Sarah, "the free woman," represents the new covenant, and the Christian Church of which that covenant is the charter. She gave birth to Isaac, who was born "by promise" "after the Spirit" that is, according to a promise the fulfilment of which involved supernatural agency "Jerusalem which is above" the Christian Church represented by Sarah "is free, which is the mother of us all," of all Christians. Believers in Christ are of the children of promise," as Isaac was. They are 'born "after the Spirit" and "of the Spirit." Thus it is as clear as the light of day that, while the Jewish Church was supplied with its members by generation, the Christian Church is furnished with its members by regeneration. This is one prominent difference between the two, and it is as great as that between death and immortality. "But as then," says the apostle, "he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now." Ishmael persecuted Isaac, and so the children of the covenant of Sinai Abraham's seed according to the flesh persecuted, in apostolic times, the beneficiaries of the new covenant, Abraham's spiritual seed. Sinai, in "gendering to bondage," also "gendered" a persecuting spirit and it is worthy of remark that an infusion of Judaism into the sentiments of any religious denomination has a tendency to make it a persecuting denomination. This fact is both significant and suggestive. "Nevertheless, what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son; for the son of the "bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free."

Here is authority for keeping all but regenerate persons out of the Christian Church: "Cast out the bondwoman and her son." The Jews, considered as Abraham's natural seed, had no right to the privileges of the church of Christ. They had first to become Christ's disciples by faith, and then they were in the important sense Abraham's seed. Paul never forgot one of the first principles of the gospel economy announced by John the Baptist to the Pharisees and the Sadducees: "Think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father; for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham" (Matthew 3:9). They were, under the New Dispensation, to claim nothing on the ground of their lineal descent from Abraham. Piety was to be an intensely personal concern. Daniel Webster once said, "The bed of death brings every human being to his pure individuality." This is true; but Christianity does the same thing before it is done by "the bed of death." The gospel places everyone on the basis of his "pure individuality" before God.

4. The supposed identity of the Jewish Church and the Christian Church involves absurdities and impossibilities.

According to this view, the scribes, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and all the Jews were members of the church; yet it is notorious that they procured the crucifixion of the Head of the church. These church members, many of them occupying "official positions," manifested bitter enmity to Christ, and said, "We will not have this man to reign over us." They charged him with being in league with

Satan in casting out demons. When he was condemned to death they said, "His blood be on us and on our children" (Matthew 27:25). Strange language for church-members to employ! Who can believe that they were members of a church "the same in substance" with the Christian Church? If the Pedobaptist position is tenable, the three thousand converts on the day of Pentecost were added to the church, though they were in it before! The Lord added daily to the church not only the saved (Acts 2:47), but those already members! When a great company of priests became obedient to the faith, they joined themselves to the apostles and were put out of the synagogues, though the Jews putting them out were of the same church! Saul of Tarsus "persecuted the church and wasted it" "made havoc" of it and when converted became a member of the church, though he had always been one! Ay, more, he obtained his authority to persecute from official members of the church. These and many other absurdities and impossibilities are involved in the supposition that the Jewish Church and the Christian Church are the same. They are not the same. The phrases "same in substance," "substantial identity," cannot avail Pedobaptists; for there is no sort of identity. A "substantial sameness" cannot be discovered with a theological microscope. Paul's teaching is that Jesus Christ makes "of twain one new man" (Ephesians 2:15) that is, regenerated Jews and Gentiles are the materials of which the new man, or church, is composed. There is reference to an organization, and the descriptive epithet "new" is applied to it. Pedobaptists virtually say that the Lord Jesus did not make a "new man." They advocate the claims of the "old man," admitting, however, that he is changed in some unimportant respect; so that his "substantial identity" remains unimpaired.

What effect would have been produced in apostolic times on the minds of unbelieving Jews if it had been intimated that their church was identical with the Christian Church? They would have been highly offended. Paul exemplified the most indignant eloquence whenever false teachers attempted to corrupt the purity of the Christian Church with the leaven of Judaism. The old Jewish Church and the church of the New Testament were regarded by believers and by unbelievers as essentially distinct. No one thought of their "substantial identity;" for infant baptism was unknown, and there was nothing to suggest the "identity" doctrine. It is as easy for a camel to go through the eye of a needle as for the identity of the Jewish and the Christian churches to be maintained. If there is no identity, infant membership in the Jewish commonwealth is no authority for infant membership in the Christian Church and it is perfectly gratuitous to insist that baptism has come in the place of circumcision. Still, the advocates of infant baptism argue that circumcision is superseded by baptism, and that, as infants were circumcised under the Jewish economy, they should be baptized under the Christian Dispensation.

SECTION VIII. The argument from circumcision fails. The position advocated by Pedobaptists will be seen from the following extracts.

Dr. Miller already referred to says: "Our next step is to show that baptism has come in the room of circumcision, and therefore that the former is rightfully and properly applied to the same subjects as the latter." Again: "There is the best foundation for asserting that baptism has come in the place of circumcision. Yet, though baptism manifestly comes in the place of circumcision, there are points in regard to which the former differs materially from the latter." [Note: Sermons on Baptism, pp. 22, 23.] Here the doctrine is stated unequivocally that "baptism has come in the place, of circumcision." How it takes its place, and yet "differs materially from it" on some "points" must ever be a mystery to persons of ordinary mental penetration.

Dr. E-ice says: "It is certain that baptism came in place of circumcision; that it answers the same ends in the church now that were answered by circumcision under the former dispensation." [Note: Debate with Campbell, p. 302.]

Dr. Summers affirms: "That baptism is the ordinance of initiation into the church, and the sign and seal of the covenant now, as circumcision was formerly, is evident." [Note: Summers on Baptism, pp. 25, 26]

I find in Dr. Hodge's Theology no statements so positive as those now quoted, but he so expresses himself that it is impossible not to infer his belief in the substitution of baptism for circumcision. But is this view, though held by great and learned men, defensible? I shall attempt to show that it is not, for the following reasons:

1. It was necessary for the circumcised to be baptized before they could become members of the church of Christ.

How was this, if baptism came in the place of circumcision and is a seal of the same covenant? Was the covenant first sealed by circumcision, and subsequently sealed by baptism? Were there two seals? If so, away goes the substitution theory. If the same persons were both circumcised and baptized, there was. SO far as they were concerned, no substitution of baptism for circumcision. In their case circumcision was not abolished, and nothing could take its place. It occupied its own place, and it was necessary for that place to be vacated before anything else could occupy it. Dr. Miller refers to baptism as coming "in the room" of circumcision; but there was no "room" till the non-observance of circumcision made room. Why, then, were those who had been circumcised baptized? Why was Jesus himself both circumcised and baptized? These are unanswerable questions if baptism came in the place of circumcision.

Dr. Miller's views involve another difficulty. He says: "The children of professing Christians are already in the church. They were born members; their baptism did not make them members. It was a public ratification and recognition of their membership. They were baptized because they were members" (p. 74). The position here assumed is demolished by one fact. That fact is that the New Testament subjects of baptism are never represented as baptized because they are in the church, but that they may enter into it. Dr. Miller's reason for administering baptism to infants labors under the misfortune of being remarkably unscriptural; for if "the children of professing Christians are already in the church," this is a very good reason for not baptizing them at all.

Anyone familiar with the baptismal controversy can see that Dr. Miller's Abrahamic and Judaistic notions vitiated his logic in its application to evangelical subjects. He reasoned in this way: The natural seed of Abraham were members of the Jewish National Church by virtue of their birth; and so far his reasoning was correct. They were circumcised because by natural generation they were made beneficiaries of the covenant of which circumcision was the "token." Dr. Miller's next step was this: The children of professing Christians are born members of the Christian Church, and are entitled to baptism, even as Abraham's natural seed were entitled to circumcision. But is this true? It cannot be. Whatever rational analogy may be traced between circumcision and baptism is on the side of the opponents of infant baptism. How plain this is! Abraham's natural seed were circumcised because they had a birthright-interest in the covenant God made with Abraham. Christians are Abraham's spiritual seed. They become so by faith in Christ, and are beneficiaries

of the new covenant, the provisions of which are eminently spiritual. There is in baptism a recognition of their interest in the blessings of this covenant. It was right to circumcise Abraham's natural seed, and it is right to baptize his spiritual seed; but who are his spiritual seed? Believers in Christ, and believers alone. Infants, therefore, have no right to baptism, because they are not Abraham's spiritual seed. Jewish infants were fit subjects for circumcision, because they were Abraham's natural seed; but neither Jewish nor Gentile infants can be his spiritual seed, because of their incapacity to believe, and therefore they ought not to be baptized. I insist, then, that correct analogical reasoning from circumcision to baptism saps the very foundation of Pedobaptism and furnishes Baptists with an argument of the strength of which they have never fully availed themselves. This may be considered a digression. If so, let us return to the subject of discussion.

I was attempting to show that baptism did not come in the place of circumcision, and referred to the well-known fact that multitudes of circumcised persons were also baptized. This could never have taken place if baptism came in the room of circumcision. In this connection, the circumcision of Timothy is worthy of notice. His mother was a Jewess, but his father a Greek. Owing to the latter fact, doubtless, he remained uncircumcised. After his conversion and baptism Timothy was circumcised by Paul. This was done to conciliate the Jews, which shows that they considered circumcision a mark of nationality. Now the question arises, Why did Paul circumcise Timothy, who had been baptized, if baptism came in the place of circumcision? Thus in the New Testament we have baptism administered after circumcision, and circumcision performed after baptism: yet Pedobaptists say that the one came in the place of the other!

2. A second fact to be noticed is that circumcision was confined to one sex.

Premises and conclusions are often wide as the poles asunder. Of this we have a striking proof in the reasoning of Pedobaptists from the circumcision of infants under the Old Dispensation to the baptism of infants under the New. The fact they begin with is of course this: Male children were circumcised under the Old Testament economy. The conclusion is: Therefore male and female children ought to be baptized under the gospel economy. Is this logic? If but one sex is recognized in the premise, how is it that there is a recognition of both sexes in the conclusion? There must be something wrong in the reasoning that brings out more in conclusions than is contained in premises. This is the misfortune of the argument now under consideration. Pedobaptists most gratuitously infer that, as children of one sex were formerly circumcised, therefore children of both sexes should now be baptized. Surely, if baptism came in place of circumcision, its administration should be confined to the male sex; but it is by divine authority administered to believers of the other sex, and therefore it did not come in place of circumcision. Pedobaptists must admit that, so far as female infants are concerned, baptism did not take the place of circumcision; for circumcision occupied no place, and therefore could not be displaced by anything' else. This is so plain as to need no elaboration.

3. The eighth day was appointed for the circumcision of infants. Is this true of infant baptism? The thing itself is not commanded, to say nothing of the time. But Pedobaptists must be met on their own ground. They say that baptism has come "in the room of circumcision." If they believe this, consistency requires that they baptize male infants alone, and that they be baptized on the eighth day. Do they pursue this course? They do not; and their failure to do so may well excite doubt whether they are perfectly satisfied with their position.

4. The Council of apostles, elders, and brethren at Jerusalem virtually denied the substitution of baptism for circumcision. In Acts 15:1-41 : we have an account of this Council. The reason for its convocation was this: "Certain men" went from Judea to Antioch and "taught the brethren," saying, "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." Paul and Barnabas joined issue with these "men," and after much disputation it was determined to send a deputation to Jerusalem to consult "the apostles and elders about this question." Paul and Barnabas belonged to this deputation, and upon their arrival at Jerusalem, before the Council met, some of the believing Pharisees urged the necessity of circumcision. The same question, therefore, was agitated both at Antioch and at Jerusalem. That question was whether the believing Gentiles ought to be circumcised. The Council met, and after due deliberation and consultation "it pleased the apostles and elders, with the whole church," to decide against the circumcision of Gentiles. Now, if baptism came in place of circumcision, the apostles knew it, and this was the time to declare it. A simple statement of the fact would have superseded all discussion. Why did they not say, "Circumcision is unnecessary, because baptism has taken its place"? This is what Pedobaptists would have said if they had been in that Council. The inspired apostles, however, did not say it. Indeed, the decision of the Council had reference to the believing Gentiles alone, and the understanding evidently was that believing Jews were at liberty to circumcise their children. This we may learn from Acts 21:17-25, and it is a fact utterly irreconcilable with the substitution of baptism for circumcision. When circumcision was regarded as a mark to designate nationality, Paul made no objection to it; but when its necessity to salvation was urged, he considered the great doctrine of justification by faith in Christ disparaged and shorn of its glory. To all circumcised with this latter view he said: "If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing" (Galatians 5:2). But to return to the Council at Jerusalem: If baptism came in place of circumcision, the very reason which called that Council together must have led to a declaration of the fact, and it is strangely unaccountable that it did not. We are forced to the conclusion that baptism was not, in apostolic times, believed to be a substitute for circumcision. Hence the Council at Jerusalem could not, and did not, say it was. Its decision involved a virtual denial of the very thing for which Pedobaptists so strenuously contend.

I have now given a specimen and but a specimen of the considerations which show that baptism has not taken the place of circumcision. A volume might be written on this one point; but it is needless. He who is not convinced by the facts already presented would not be convinced "though one should rise from the dead." The Scripture argument on infant baptism is now closed. I have examined the New Testament claim of infants to baptism, and also the Old Testament claim, and can perceive no mark of validity in either. My readers will therefore allow me to endorse what the North British Review, the organ of the Free (Presbyterian) Church of Scotland, says in its number for August, 1852: "SCRIPTURE KNOWS NOTHING OF THE BAPTISM OF INFANTS."

SECTION IX. The historical argument examined. From the word of God, Pedobaptists go to church history and seek "aid and comfort" from its records. What does church history say of infant baptism? Much, I admit; but there is no proof that it was practised before the latter part of the second century. The proof is by no means conclusive that it was practised before the third century. This the reader will see as historical facts are presented.

I quote from Dr. Wall of the Church of England, whose History of Infant Baptism is in high repute wherever the English language is spoken. Referring, in chap. 3, to the well-known passage in

Irenaeus, he says, "Since this is the first express mention that we have met with of infants baptized, it is worth the while to look back and consider how near this man was to the apostles time." Irenaeus, according to Dr. Wall's chronology, lived about the year 167. It is well to give the disputed passage. Here it is: "For he [Christ] came to save all persons by himself: all, I mean, who by him are regenerated [or baptized] unto God; infants, and little ones, and children, and youths, and elder persons. Therefore he went through every age; for infants being an infant, sanctifying infants" etc. It is needless to quote further, for the controversy is about the meaning of the word "regenerated." It will be observed that Dr. Wall interpolates "baptized" as its meaning. *Renascor* is the word used in the Latin translation; for the original Greek is lost. That *renascor* means "born again" or "regenerated" is beyond dispute; nor is it necessary to deny that the "Fathers," so called, sometimes use it as synonymous with "baptized." Baptists, however, deny that it has this meaning in the passage under consideration, and distinguished Pedobaptists agree with them, as the following quotations prove. The learned Winer, speaking of infant baptism, says, "Irenaeus does not mention it, as has been supposed." [Note: *Christian Review*, vol. 3, p. 213.]

Dr. Doddridge says, "We have only a Latin translation of this work; and some critics have supposed this passage spurious, or, allowing it to be genuine, it will not be granted that to be regenerate always in his writings signifies "baptized." [Note: *Miscellaneous Works*, p. 493]

Pedobaptists must deeply feel their need of something to sustain their practice when they attempt to extort from Irenaeus testimony in favor of infant baptism. He says nothing about baptism in connection with infants.

Tertullian, who lived about the year 200, is often referred to by Pedobaptists as the first opponent of infant baptism, but they argue that his opposition proves the existence of the practice. It is by no means certain that Tertullian refers to the baptism of infants. The term which he uses, and which Dr. Wall translates "little children," is *parvulos*. Irenaeus speaks of *infantes*, *parvulos*. He makes a distinction between *infantes* and *parvulos*. If Tertullian uses the latter term as Irenaeus did, he does not refer to the baptism of unconscious infants, but to the baptism of "little children." These "little children" may have been capable of exercising faith in Christ. Whether they were or not I do not undertake to decide. It is true, however, that Tertullian, owing to his peculiar views, advised a delay of baptism on the part of certain classes of persons who had reached mature years.

Having come down to the beginning of the third century, may I not say that if infant baptism rests for its support on the practice of the first two centuries, it rests on a foundation of sand? To the end of two hundred years it has no distinct historical recognition. From Tertullian, Dr. Wall comes to Origen, whom he represents as living about the year 210. Origen wrote in Greek, and his works in the original were chiefly lost and Latin translations remain. Dr. Wall says "only the Latin translations." However this may be, he tells us that "upon the renewal of learning" nothing was admitted to be Origen's except translations made "into Latin either by St. Hierom [Note: Same as "Jerome."] or Rufinus" He accords fidelity to Hierom in his translations, but says that "Rufinus altered or left out anything that he thought not orthodox." Nor is this all; for these significant words are added: "Whereas now in these Translations of Rufinus the reader is uncertain (as Erasmus angrily says) whether he read Origen or Rufinus." [Note: *History of Infant Baptism*, chap. 5: In quoting from Dr. Wall I refer to chapters rather than to pages, because his *History* is published in different forms. I have the edition of 1705.]

Dr. Wall admits that Origen's Homilies on Leviticus and his Comments on the Epistle to the Romans were translated by Rufinus; and in these productions we are supposed to have his strongest testimony in favor of infant baptism. In his eighth Homily he is represented as saying, "Infants also are, by the usage of the church, baptized." In his comments on Romans this language is attributed to him: "The church had from the apostles a tradition [or order] to give baptism even to infants." This is Dr. Wall's translation. He was very anxious to translate the Latin term *traditio* "order." It seems, however, that he had some misgiving, and therefore put the word "order" in brackets. Let it not be forgotten that the translation of these portions of Origen's works was made from Greek into Latin by Rufinus, who "altered or left out anything that he thought riot orthodox." Who knows, therefore who can ever know whether Origen wrote what is here ascribed to him? What alterations were made in his writings? Such as Rufinus, in his orthodoxy, thought proper. What things were "left out"? Only those that Rufinus thought ought to be left out! Erasmus, a prodigy of learning in his day, was uncertain whether he read "Origen or Rufinus." But if Origen did say what Rufinus represents him as saying, what does it amount to? Absolutely nothing with those who recognize the word of God as the only rule of faith and practice. The "usage of the church" and "a tradition from the apostles" are referred to as authority for infant baptism; there is no appeal to the Holy Scriptures. Who but a Romanist is willing to practise infant baptism as a tradition, and not a divine ordinance? Origen's testimony is valuable to a Papist, entirely worthless to a Protestant.

Leaving the "uncertain" writings of Origen, Dr. Wall conducts us into the Council of Carthage, in the year 253. This Council was composed of sixty-six bishops, or pastors, and Cyprian presided over it. One of the questions submitted to its decision was whether a child should be baptized before it was eight days old. Fidus, who presented the question, was in the negative; and rightly too, if the law of circumcision was to regulate the matter. The very fact that such a question was sent to the Council shows that infant baptism was a new thing. Had it been practised from the days of the apostles, the point whether a child should be baptized before the eighth day would have been settled before A. D. 253. The Council decided against the delay of baptism, assigning this weighty reason: "As far as in us lies, no soul, if possible, is to be lost." Here it will be seen that the necessity of baptism, in order to salvation, is recognized. In this supposed necessity infant baptism, doubtless, had its origin. This will be clear when the testimony of the great Neander is presented. The Council of Carthage attempted to justify infant baptism by referring to the fact that when the son of the Shunammite widow (2 Kings 4:1-44) died, the prophet Elisha so stretched himself on the child as to apply his face to the child's face, his feet to the child's feet, etc. By this, said the Council, "spiritual equality is intimated" that is, a child is spiritually equal to a grown person! A conclusive reason for infant baptism, truly! The cause must be desperate, indeed, when the decision of a Council that could gravely advance such a conceit as an argument is invoked to sustain it. [Note: The reader who wishes to verify the statements here made concerning the Council of Carthage may refer to Wall's History, chap. 6.]

It is not necessary to refer to other of the so-called "Christian Fathers," especially to Augustine, as testifying in favor of infant baptism for Baptists do not deny that infants were baptized from the days of Cyprian. Augustine, who died A. D. 430, refers to infant baptism as an apostolic tradition: *apostolica traditio* is the phrase he employs. He meant, no doubt, that it was handed down from the apostles by tradition that infants were to be baptized. This implies the silence of the New

Testament on the subject. No one would say that it was handed down by tradition that believers are to be baptized. Why? Because the baptism of believers is so clearly taught that tradition is precluded. Not so as to infant baptism; for here there is room for tradition, because in regard to this rite the Scriptures are as silent as the grave. As to Augustine himself, the tradition to which he refers was not sufficiently operative to secure his baptism in infancy, though his mother, Monica, was a pious woman. He was not baptized till thirty years of age.

It has been intimated that the testimony of the great church historian Neander is decisive as to the origin of infant baptism in its supposed necessity in order to salvation. He says, "That not till so late a period as (at least, certainly not earlier than) Irenaeus a trace of infant baptism appears, and that it first became recognized as an apostolic tradition in the course of the third century, is evidence rather against than for the admission of its apostolic origin; specially since, in the spirit of the age when Christianity appeared, there were many elements which must have been favorable to the introduction of infant baptism the same elements from which proceeded the notion of the magical effects of outward baptism, the' notion of its absolute necessity for salvation, the notion which gave rise to the my thus [myth] that the apostles baptized the Old-Testament saints in Hades. How very much must infant baptism have corresponded with such a tendency if it had been favored by tradition! [Note: Planting and Training of the Church, p. 102.]

Dr. Wall in the second part of his History, chap. 6, referring to the "ancient Fathers," says, "They differ concerning the future state of infants dying unbaptized; but all agreed that they missed of heaven." In view of this testimony of two Pedobaptists of great celebrity, who does not see that infant baptism originated from its supposed inseparable connection with salvation? A deplorable misconception of the truth of the gospel gave it birth, while misapprehension of the teachings of the New Testament prolongs its injurious existence. The "historical argument" for infant baptism affords very little "aid and comfort" to Pedobaptists. But suppose it was a thousand times stronger; suppose every writer from the death of the last apostle had expressed himself in favor of it; even then it would be nothing less than an act of will worship while the Scriptures are silent concerning it. The perplexing question, "Who hath required this at your hands?" should confound its advocates. "The Bible, the Bible alone" said Chillingworth, "is the religion of Protestants." Arguments from antiquity, to be available, must penetrate the antiquity of the apostolic age and rest on the teachings of the New Testament. All other arguments are worthless.

SECTION X.

Objections to infant baptism. In view of the considerations presented in the preceding pages, there must be very serious objections to infant baptism. Some of these objections will now be considered.

1. A decided objection to it is that its advocates cannot agree why it should be practised.

How conflicting, how antagonistic, their opinions! Roman Catholics baptize infants, in order to their salvation. They consider baptism essential to the salvation of both adults and infants. They have sometimes shown the sincerity of their belief by attempting to baptize children before they were born. Episcopalians, in accepting the teachings of the "Book of Common Prayer," baptize infants to make them children of God by regeneration. John Calvin, as may be seen in his Life by Henry (vol. 1, pp. 82, 83), maintains that infants are capable of exercising faith, and that their baptism is

an exemplification of believers' baptism. This seems also to have been Martin Luther's opinion. John Wesley in his Treatise on Baptism says, "If infants are guilty of original sin, they are proper subjects of baptism, seeing, in the ordinary way, that they cannot be saved, unless this be washed away in baptism." The "Directory" of the Westminster Assembly places the right of the infants of believers to baptism on the ground that they are "federally holy." The opinion held by probably the larger number of Protestant Pedobaptists is that infants are baptized "to bring them into the church." But Dr. Samuel Miller, as we have seen, insists that the children of Christian parents are born members of the church, and are baptized because they are members: while Dr. Summers derives the right of infants to baptism from "their personal connection with the Second Adam." These are specimens of the reasons urged in favor of infant baptism. How contradictory! How antagonistic! It seems that infants are to be baptized that they may be saved; that they may be regenerated; because they have faith; because their parents are believers; because they are involved in original sin; because they are holy; because they ought to be brought into the church; because they are in the church by virtue of their birth; and because of their "personal connection" with Christ, in consequence of his assumption of human nature. It would be well for the various sects of Pedobaptists to call a Council to decide why infants should be baptized. The reasons in favor of the practice are at present so contradictory and so self-destructive that it must involve the advocates of the system in great perplexity. Many, though, would object to such a Council because, for obvious reasons, the Pope of Rome should preside over it, and others would object because it would probably be in session as long as the Council of Trent. Still, if one good reason could be furnished for infant baptism by the united wisdom of Romanists and Protestants, it would be more satisfactory than all the reasons which are now urged.

2. A second objection to infant baptism is that its tendency is to unite the church and the world.

Jesus Christ evidently designed the church to be the light of the world. His followers are not of the world, but are chosen out of the world. If anything in the New Testament is plain, it is plain that the Lord Jesus intended that there should be a line of demarcation between the church and the world. It is needless to argue a point so clear. Now, the tendency of infant baptism is to unite the church and the world, and thus to obliterate the line of demarcation which the Saviour has established. Let the principles of Pedobaptism universally prevail, and one of three things will inevitably follow either there will be no church, or there will be no world, or there will be a worldly church. The universal prevalence of Pedobaptist sentiments would bring all "born of the flesh" into the church. To be born, not to be born again, would be the qualification for membership. The unregenerate members would be in a large majority. The world would absorb the church, or, to say the least, there would be an intensely worldly church. Is this not true of the national churches of Europe? The time has been, whatever may be the case now, when in England "partaking of the Lord's Supper" preceded the holding of the civil and military offices of the kingdom. Thus a premium was offered for hypocrisy, and many an infidel availed himself of it. In the United States of America there are so many counteracting influences that infant baptism, cannot fully develop its tendency to unite the church and the world. Indeed, in some respects, Pedobaptists practically repudiate their own principles. They do not treat their "baptized children" as church-members. If they did, there would be a deplorable state of things. The unregenerate members of local congregations would generally be in the majority, and would exert a controlling influence.

3. Another objection to infant baptism is that it cherishes in “baptized children” the delusive belief that they are better than others; that their salvation is more hopeful. In many instances, it is to be feared, they are led to consider themselves in a saved state. The children of Romanists must so regard themselves if they attribute to baptism the efficacy ascribed to it by Papists. If the children of Episcopalians believe the “Book of Common Prayer,” they must grow up under the false persuasion that in their baptism they “were made members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven.” If the children of Methodists believe the “Discipline,” and that the prayer offered at their baptism was heard, they must recognize themselves as baptized not only “with water,” but “with the Holy Ghost.” If the children of Presbyterians believe the “Westminster Confession” and the “Directory,” they look upon themselves as “federally holy” “in covenant with God” and consider that “the covenant was sealed by their baptism.” Will not all these classes of children imagine themselves better than others? Will they not, under the teaching they receive, view other children as consigned to the “uncovenanted mercies” of God, while they occupy a high vantage-ground? Will not their delusive belief present a serious obstacle in the way of their salvation? Is there any rational probability of their salvation, unless they disbelieve the dogmas inculcated in their baptism? Will the children of Roman Catholics ever be saved while they regard their baptism as having placed them in a saved state? Will the children of Episcopalians become the “children of God” so long as they entertain the absurd notion that they were made his children by baptism? Will the children of Methodists be regenerated while they imagine that they have been baptized “with the Holy Ghost”? Will the children of Presbyterians repent and acknowledge their guilt and condemnation before God while they lay the “flattering unction to their souls” that they are “federally holy” and “in covenant with God”?

I would not give offence, but must say that Pedobaptist children must take the first step in the pursuit of salvation by practically denying the truth of what they have been taught concerning their baptism. It will be asked, Are not thousands of the children of Pedobaptists converted to God? I gladly concede it; but why is it so? One prominent reason, doubtless, is that, on the part of their ministers and parents, there is a practical repudiation of their baptismal theories. The “baptized children,” whatever the baptismal formulas may say, are taught that they are sinners, unregenerate, lost, condemned, and exposed to the wrath of God, for the very reason that they are not “in covenant” with him. Thanks be to God that the preaching and teaching of Pedobaptists do not accord with their “Creeds,” so far as the subject of infant baptism is concerned! The discrepancy is vital to the welfare of their offspring. There are some happy inconsistencies.

4. A fourth objection to infant baptism is that it interferes with the independent action of the minds of “baptized children” on the subject of baptism, and in numberless instances prevents baptism on a profession of faith in Christ.

Suppose, when “baptized children” reach mature years, they are, as is often the case, annoyed with doubts concerning the validity of their baptism. They feel at once that they cannot entertain these doubts without virtually calling in question the propriety of what their parents caused to be done for them in their infancy. Filial respect and reverence present almost insuperable barriers in the way of an impartial investigation of the subject. The question comes up, Shall we reflect on the wisdom of our parents by declaring their act null and void? If the parents are dead and gone to be with Christ, the difficulty is often greater. The question then assumes this form: Shall we repudiate what our now glorified parents did for us in our infancy? It often requires a great struggle to

surmount the difficulty, and in many cases it is never surmounted. It is unquestionably true that the influence of infant baptism interferes with the unbiased action of many minds with regard to scriptural baptism. How great would be the number of those who, but for their infant baptism so called, would be baptized on a profession of faith in Christ! They hesitate to say that the “infantile rite” was worthless. They know that great and good men have practised infant baptism. Their minds are perplexed. They wish it had so happened that they had not been baptized in infancy. Still, the sprinkling of the baptismal (!) waters on them in infancy now prevents an intelligent immersion into Christ on a profession of faith in his name. Is it not an objection to infant baptism that it prevents so many from obeying Christ, and even fosters a spirit of disobedience?

5. As a last objection to infant baptism, I refer to its tendency to supplant believers’ baptism and banish it from the world. This objection, though presented last, is first in importance. It is, indeed, the capital objection, and if exhibited in all its phases would virtually embrace all objections. It is not, however, necessary to dwell on it at length, because its force and conclusiveness are readily seen. By all who practise baptism at all it is admitted that the New Testament enjoins the baptism of believers in Christ. The universality of this admission precludes the necessity of proof. The baptism of believers, then, is a divine ordinance. Is it reasonable to suppose that two divine ordinances antagonize with each other? Is it credible that this is the case? Pedobaptists say that infant baptism is a divine ordinance, and they are slow to admit that it antagonizes with the baptism of believers. But the antagonism is direct, positive. The inevitable tendency of infant baptism is to supplant the baptism of believers. This is owing to the fact that it is practically regarded by Pedobaptists as superseding the necessity of believers’ baptism. It must be so regarded, or it is made null and void. When baptized infants grow up to maturity and become believers in Christ, there is nothing said among Pedobaptists about baptism on a profession of faith. No; the baptism of the unconscious infant is allowed to prevent the baptism of the intelligent believer. Hence it is easy to see the tendency of infant baptism to supplant and banish the baptism of believers from the world. A supposition will make this so plain that no one can misunderstand it: Let it be supposed, then, that the principles of Pedobaptists prevail throughout the world. All parents come into the church and have their children baptized in infancy. If this supposition were realized, where would believers’ baptism be? It would in one generation be utterly supplanted and banished from the world. An ordinance established by Christ to be observed to the end of time would be abolished. There would be no scriptural baptism on earth. One of the institutions of the Head of the church would not be permitted to have a place in the world which he made, and in which he labored, toiled suffered, and died! How startling and fearful is this! A human tradition arraying itself against an ordinance of Heaven, and attempting to destroy it and leave no memorial of its existence on the face of the globe!

Influenced by the considerations presented in the ten sections of this chapter, Baptists regard infant baptism as utterly destitute of scriptural support; and, in view of its many evils, they are most decided in their opposition to it. On the other hand, they are the earnest advocates of the baptism of believers in Christ; and of believers alone. In this opposition and in this advocacy may be seen one of the prominent **DISTINCTIVE PRINCIPLES OF BAPTISTS**.

02.2. CHAPTER 2. BAPTISTS CONSIDER THE IMMERSION IN WATER OP A BELIEVER IN CHRIST ESSENTIAL. ...

CHAPTER 2. BAPTISTS CONSIDER THE IMMERSION IN WATER OP A BELIEVER IN CHRIST ESSENTIAL. TO BAPTISM SO ESSENTIAL THAT WITHOUT IT THERE IS NO BAPTISM.

SECTION I.

Greek lexicons give “immerse,” “dip” or “plunge”

as the primary, ordinary, and literal meaning of “baptizo.” IN the common version of the Scriptures baptizo and baptisma are Anglicized, but not translated. This is invariably true of the latter term, and it is true of the former whenever the ordinance of baptism is referred to. Baptismos is used four times. In three instances it has no reference to the baptismal ordinance, and is translated “washing;” which washing was evidently the result of immersion. In the other instance it is Anglicized. Bapto, from which baptizo is derived, is employed in the Greek New Testament three times, and emBapto three times. Both are translated “dip” in the common version. There is no more difference in their meaning than there is between the word “dip” and the phrase “dip in.”

These verbs are never used in connection with baptism as a religious ordinance; baptizo is the verb always used.

I have referred to baptizo and baptisma as Anglicized words. By this it is meant that their termination is made to correspond with the termination of English words. In baptizo the final letter is changed into e, and in baptisma the last letter is dropped altogether. To make this matter of Anglicism perfectly plain, it is only necessary to say that if the Greek rantizo, meaning “sprinkle,” had been Anglicized, we should have “rantize” in the New Testament wherever we now have “sprinkle.” The version of the Bible now in common use was made by order of King James I. of England, and was first published in the year 1611. The king gave a number of rules for the guidance of his translators, and the third rule virtually forbids the translation of “baptize” and “baptism.” This third rule is as follows: “The old ecclesiastical words to be kept, as the word ‘church’ not to be translated ‘congregation.’” It is absurd to say that this rule had exclusive reference to the term “church,” for this term is manifestly given as a specimen of “old ecclesiastical words;” and why should “words” be mentioned if the rule was to be applied to but one word? The question, then, is, Are “baptism” and “baptize” “old ecclesiastical words”? They were words when the Bible was translated, or they would not be found in it. They had been used by church historians and by writers on ecclesiastical law, and were, therefore, ecclesiastical. They had been in use a long time, and were, consequently, old. They were “old ecclesiastical words,” such words as the king commanded “to be kept” “not to be translated.” It is worthy of notice, too, that the Bishop of London, at the king’s instance, wrote to the translators, reminding them that His Majesty wished his “third and fourth rule” to be specially observed. [Note: See Lewis’s History of Translations, pp. 317, 319.] This circumstance must have called particular attention to the rule under consideration. In view of these facts, it may surely be said that the translators knew what were “old ecclesiastical

words.” Let their testimony, then, be adduced. In their “Preface to the Reader” they say that they had, “on the one side, avoided the scrupulosity of the Puritans, who left the old ecclesiastical words and betook them to other, as when they put washing ‘for’ baptism ‘and’ congregation ‘for’ church; and, on the other hand, had shunned the obscurity of the Papists.” Is not this enough? Here there is not only an admission that “baptism” was included in the “old ecclesiastical words,” but this admission is made by the translators themselves made most cheerfully, for it was made in condemnation of the Puritans and in commendation of themselves. The position that King James virtually forbade the translation of “baptize” and “baptism” is established by the foregoing considerations; but to give it additional strength I refer to the king’s fourth rule, as follows: “When any word hath divers significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most eminent Fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place and the analogy of faith. Suppose I were to admit, for argument’s sake, what some Pedobaptists insist on namely, that baptizo has divers significations. What then? Every man of intelligence knows that from the days of the apostles to the reign of King James “immerse” was its commonly-received meaning. Was not immersion ordinarily practised for thirteen hundred years Dr. Whitby, Dr. Wall, Professor Moses Stuart, and I know not how many other Pedobaptists of distinction, make this concession. Far be it from me to say that baptizo is a word of “divers significations” but even if it were, the king’s translators, if they had translated it at all, would have been compelled to render it “immerse,” for it was “most commonly used” in this sense by “the most eminent Fathers.” But it will be seen that the king’s third rule makes inoperative his fourth, so far as “old ecclesiastical words” are concerned. Whether such words have one meaning or a thousand meanings they are “to be kept” “not to be translated.” The translators were not at liberty to refer to the signification immemorially attached by the Greeks to baptizo a signification which received the cordial endorsement of “the most eminent Fathers.” They might have examined the endorsement if the royal decree had not said, “Hitherto, but no farther” “the old ecclesiastical words to be kept.” The fact that “baptize” is an Anglicized, and not a translated, word makes an appeal to Greek lexicons necessary to ascertain its meaning. Lexicons, it is true, do not constitute the ultimate authority, but their testimony is highly important. I have made it a point to examine all the lexicons I have seen (and they have been many) concerning the import of baptizo. There is among them a remarkable unanimity in representing “immerse,” or its equivalent, as the primary and ordinary meaning of the word. According to lexicographers, it is a word of definite import as much so as any other. It is as specific as rantizo, and it might be argued just as plausibly that rantizo means “to immerse” as that baptizo means “to sprinkle.” I have seen no lexicon that gives “sprinkle” as a meaning of baptizo, and but one that makes “to pour upon” one of its significations. In the first edition of Liddell & Scott’s Greek-and-English lexicon “to pour upon” is given as the seventh meaning of baptizo. It is a significant fact, however, that, while passages in classic Greek authors are referred to as illustrative of the ordinary meaning of the word, there is no mention of any passage that sustains the definition “to pour upon.”

It is worthy of special remark that the second edition of Liddell & Scott does not contain the phrase “to pour upon.” This is an important fact, of which Baptists may avail themselves. It has been well said by a scholar now dead: [Note: Rev. W. C. Duncan, D. D.] “When it is remembered that the definition ‘pour upon’ was assigned to baptizo in the first English edition, on the authority of Francis Passow, whose German work forms the basis of that of Liddell & Scott, this change in the second English edition is an admission as gratifying to Baptists as it is unwelcome to their

opponents. Messrs. Liddell & Scott, who cannot be charged with a leaning to Baptist sentiments, have deliberately, after due examination, withdrawn their authority in favor of 'pour upon' as a signification of the verb baptizo, and now define the word just as Baptist scholars have defined it after a careful study of the passages in which it occurs in the Greek authors. Of such a concession Baptists know well how to take advantage."

I now repeat that there is among lexicons a perfect concurrence in assigning "immerse" or its equivalent as the primary and ordinary meaning of baptizo. This ought to settle the baptismal controversy. For what says Blackstone, who is almost the idol of the legal profession? "Words are generally to be understood in their usual and most known signification; not so much regarding the propriety of grammar as their general and popular use." [Note: Sharswood's Blackstone, vol., 1: p. 58.] "Immerse" was the "usual and most known signification" of baptizo among the Greeks. It was its "general and popular use," as we shall see in the proper place. To return to the argument derived from lexicons: All English dictionaries give "immerse" or its equivalent as the ordinary meaning of "dip." It would, therefore, be very unreasonable to deny that "dip" ordinarily means "to immerse." Greek lexicons give "immerse" as the ordinary meaning of baptizo. Is it not, then, just as unreasonable to deny that baptizo ordinarily means "to immerse" as it would be to deny that "dip" has this signification? Indeed, there is no argument employed by Pedobaptists to divest baptizo of its usual meaning which may not as plausibly be employed to divest "dip" of its ordinary import; for, though "dip" is a definite and specific word, baptizo is more so. We speak of "the dip of the magnetic needle" and of "the dip of a stratum in geology," while Pope uses the expression "dipping into a volume of history." If Pedobaptists could find baptizo in such connections, there would be rejoicing from Dan to Beersheba. The man who would attempt to prove that "dip" means "to sprinkle" or "pour" would probably be laughed at; but he could make a more plausible effort in adducing his proof than if he were to attempt to prove the same thing concerning baptizo. Let us see: Such a man might say that Johnson, Webster, and Worcester in their large dictionaries give "moisten" and "wet" as meanings of "dip," and refer as authority to Milton, who uses the following words: "A cold shuddering dew dips me all over." Talking with himself, such a reasoner might say, "It is a fixed fact that 'dip' means 'to moisten' and 'wet.' Who will dispute what Johnson, Webster, and Worcester say, sustained as they are by the 'prince of British poets'? Very well. 'Dip' means to 'moisten' and 'wet'. Everybody knows that a thing can be moistened or made wet by having water poured or sprinkled on it. Therefore, 'dip' means 'to pour' and 'sprinkle'. Now, I affirm that this argument is more plausible than any I ever heard from a Pedobaptist to prove that baptizo means "pour" and "sprinkle;" yet it is replete with sophistry. It assumes as true the fallacy that if a process can be accomplished in two different ways, the two verbs employed to denote those two ways mean the same thing. An object may be moistened by being dipped in water, but "moisten" and "dip" are not synonymous. The same object may be moistened by having water sprinkled or poured on it, but neither "moisten and sprinkle," nor "moisten and pour," are identical in import. Though the moistening may result from the dipping, sprinkling, or pouring, the three acts are clearly distinguishable, and definite terms are used to express them.

It is proper to say of the Greek lexicons to which I have referred that they were all made by men who had no partialities for Baptists. A regard for truth, therefore, and no desire to give currency to the practice of immersion, elicited from them the definition they have given of baptizo. Baptists may well felicitate themselves that their opponents bear this strong testimony.

SECTION II.

Distinguished Pedobaptist scholars and theologians admit that “baptizo” means “to immerse.”

Here I shall probably be told that it is unfair to take advantage of Pedobaptist concessions. There is, however, nothing unfair in such a course. No one can say that there is without calling in question the propriety of what Paul did in his great discourse at Athens; for he availed himself of the declaration of a Greek poet, and made the poetic statement a part of his argument. I shall aim to do nothing that is not justified by the example of the great apostle. Pedobaptist concessions are of great value, for it may be said, in the language of another on a different matter, “This testimony of theirs, to me, is worth a thousand others, seeing it comes from such as, in my opinion, are evidently interested to speak quite otherwise” The reader’s earnest attention is called to the following extracts.

I begin with John Calvin, a learned Presbyterian, who lived more than three hundred years ago. He was very decided in his opposition to Baptists, or “Anabaptists,” as he contemptuously styled them. He wrote in Latin, and I avail myself of the translation of John Allen, published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, Philadelphia. In his Institutes (vol. 2, book 4, chap. 15, paragraph 19, p. 491) he says, “But whether the person who is baptized be wholly immersed, and whether thrice or once, or whether water be only poured or sprinkled upon him, is of no importance; churches ought to be left at liberty, in this respect, to act according to the difference of countries. The very word baptize, however, signifies ‘to immerse;’ and it is certain that immersion was the practice of the ancient Church.”

It will be seen that Calvin expresses two opinions and states two facts. The opinions are that it is of no importance how water is used, and that churches should be free to decide as they please; the facts are that “baptize” means “to immerse” and that immersion was the practice of the ancient church. With Calvin’s opinions I have nothing to do, but his facts claim attention. What “baptize” means is a question of fact, and must be decided by testimony. So of the practice of the ancient church. Calvin gave his verdict on the testimony establishing the facts. The reader will observe the distinction between opinions and facts.

Dr. George Campbell, a learned Presbyterian of Scotland, who lived about a hundred years ago, in his notes on Matthew 3:11, says, “The word baptizein” (infinitive mode, present tense, of baptizo), “both in sacred authors and in classical, signifies ‘to dip,’ ‘to plunge,’ ‘to immerse,’ and was rendered by Tertullian, the oldest of the Latin Fathers, tingere—the term used for dyeing cloth, which was by immersion. It is always construed suitably to this meaning.” In his Lectures on Systematic Theology and Pulpit Eloquence he expresses himself, in Lecture X., as follows: “Another error in disputation which is by far too common is when one will admit nothing in the plea or arguments of an adversary to be of the smallest weight ... I have heard a disputant of this stamp, in defiance of etymology and use, maintain that the word rendered in the New Testament ‘baptize’ means, more properly, ‘to sprinkle’ than ‘to plunge’ and, in defiance of all antiquity, that the former method was the earliest, and for many centuries the most general, practice in baptizing. One who argues in this manner never fails, with persons of knowledge, to betray the cause he would defend; and though, with respect to the vulgar, bold assertions generally succeed as well as arguments sometimes better yet a candid mind will disdain to take the help of a falsehood even in support of the truth.”

Dr. Thomas Chalmers, for many years regarded by all as the greatest Presbyterian theologian of Scotland, and by some as the greatest theologian of the world in his day, uses the following language: "The original meaning of the word 'baptism' is 'immersion;' and, though we regard it as a point of indifference whether the ordinance so named be performed in this way or by sprinkling, yet we doubt not that the prevalent style of the administration in the apostles' days was by an actual submerging of the whole body under water. We advert to this for the purpose of throwing light on the analogy that is instituted on these verses. Jesus Christ, by death, underwent this sort of baptism even immersion under the surface of the ground, whence he soon emerged again by his resurrection We, by being baptized into his death, are conceived to have made a similar translation." [Note: Lectures on Romans, Lecture XXX., on chap. 6: 3-7.]

Professor Moses Stuart, the most renowned Congregationalist of his day, and the ornament of the Theological Seminary of Andover, Massachusetts, in his treatise on the Mode of Baptism (p. 14), says: [Note: This is a reprint from the Biblical Repository, vol. 3, No. 11.] "Bapto and baptizo mean 'to dip,' 'plunge' or 'immerge' into anything liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this. My proof of this position, then, need not necessarily be protracted; but for the sake of ample confirmation I must beg the reader's patience while I lay before him, as briefly as may be, the results of an investigation which seems to leave no room for doubt."

I will also give the testimony of an eminent man who has recently died. Dean Stanley, in an article on "Baptism" in the Nineteenth Century for October, 1879, says: "For the first thirteen centuries the almost universal practice of baptism was that of which we read in the New Testament, and which is the very meaning of the word 'baptize' that those who were baptized were plunged, submerged, immersed, into the water." But why proceed farther with the testimony of distinguished Pedobaptist scholars and theologians?

What I have adduced is surely sufficient. These witnesses testify that baptizo means "to immerse;" nor do they say that it means "to sprinkle" and "pour." True it is that Calvin thought immersion or sprinkling a matter of "no importance," and Chalmers regarded it as a "point of indifference;" but they are both clear as to what the word baptizo means. This is all I want their testimony as to the meaning of the word. Their opinion as to the admissibility of sprinkling I reject, for it is utterly gratuitous unless baptizo means "to sprinkle." This they did not say, and could not say. The distinction between a fact and an opinion deserves special notice. He who, acquainted with the *usus loquendi* of a term, testifies that it means a certain thing, bears witness to &fact; but if he says that it is not important to adhere to the meaning established by the *usus loquendi*, he expresses an opinion.

It may be asked why those Pedobaptist scholars who concede that baptizo means "to immerse" have not become practical immersionists. This is a question difficult to answer. That they ought to have shown their faith by their works does not admit a doubt. Some, perhaps, have failed to do so on account of early predilections; others have not felt willing to disturb their denominational relations; and others still have had a horror of the charge of fickleness. Probably, however, the greater number, like Professor Stuart, have persuaded themselves that, as the Christian Dispensation is eminently spiritual, it is a matter of little moment, provided the heart is right, as to a particular observance of "external rites." Such persons seem to forget that the way to show that the heart is right with God is to do the very thing he has commanded. The reasons suggested for

the failure of those Pedobaptists who have made such concessions as have been quoted to do their duty are, I must say, unsatisfactory. Satisfactory reasons cannot be given, for impossibilities cannot be performed. Those who admit that Jesus Christ commanded his disciples to be immersed, and at the same time array themselves in practical opposition to immersion, are accountable to him. Here the matter must be left.

SECTION III. The classical usage of “baptizo” establishes the position of Baptists.

I have said that lexicons are not the ultimate authority in settling the meaning of words. The truth of this statement can be readily seen. Lexicographers are necessarily dependent on the sense in which words are used to ascertain their meaning. But it is possible for them to mistake that sense. If they do, there is an appeal from their definitions to usage (called the *usus loquendi*), which is the ultimate authority. I shall now show how classic Greek authors used the word baptize not that I complain of the lexicons, but that I may show that the usage of the word fully justifies the lexicons in giving “immerse” or its equivalent as its primary, ordinary, literal meaning. It is pleasant to go back to the ultimate authority.

Few men ever examined the classical import of baptizo more extensively than the late Dr. Alexander Carson, and the result of his labors is before the public. Since his death Dr. T. J. Conant has gone more exhaustively into the subject, apparently leaving nothing more to be said. These accomplished scholars prove beyond question that baptizo was used by the Greeks in the sense of “immerse;” but, as I prefer not to quote from Baptist authors, I do not avail myself of the learned labors of Drs. Carson and Conant. For obvious reasons, I give the preference to Pedobaptist testimony. The following extracts, therefore, are made from Professor Stuart on the Mode of Baptism. He refers to a number of Greek authors.

PINDAR, who was born five hundred and twenty years before Christ, says: “As when a net is cast into the sea the cork swims above, so am I UNPLUNGED (*abaptistos*); on which the Greek scholiast, in commenting, says: As the cork (*ou dunei*) does not sink, so I am *abaptistos* unplunged, not immersed. The cork remains *abaptistos*, and swims on the surface of the sea, being of a nature which is *abaptistos*; in like manner, I am *abaptistos*.”

Pindar was describing the utter incompetency of his enemies to plunge him into ruin. It is only necessary to say to the English scholar, that the letter *a* (in Greek, “alpha”), prefixed in the foregoing extract to *baptistos*, conveys a negative idea. *Abaptistos*, therefore, means “unplunged,” “undipped,” “unimmersed.” “Unsprinkled” or “unpoured” is perfectly out of the question.

HIPPOCRATES, who lived about four hundred and thirty years before the Christian era, says: “Shall I not laugh at the man who SINKS (*baptisanta*) his ship by overloading it, and then complains of the sea for engulfing it with its cargo?”

ARISTOTLE, who died three hundred and thirty two years before Christ, “speaks of a saying among the Phenicians, that there were certain places, beyond the Pillars of Hercules, which when it is ebb-tide are not OVERFLOWED (*mee baptizesthai*)”

HERACLIDUS PONTICUS, a disciple of Aristotle, says: “When a piece of iron is taken red hot from the fire and PLUNGED in the water (*hudati baptizetai*), the heat, being quenched by the peculiar nature of the water, ceases”

DIODORUS SICULUS, who lived about the middle of the century before Christ, uses these words: "Most of the land-animals that are intercepted by the river [Nile] perish, being OVERWHELMED." Again: "The river, borne along by a more violent current, OVERWHELMED (ebaptise) many"

STRABO, the celebrated geographer, who died A. D. 25 a very short time before John the Baptist began to preach in the wilderness of Judea speaking of a lake near Agrigentum, says: Things that elsewhere cannot float DO NOT SINK (mee baptizesthai) in the water of this lake, but swim in the manner of wood." Again: "If one shoots an arrow into the channel [of a certain rivulet in Cappadocia], the force of the water resists it so much that it mil scarcely PLUNGE IN (baptizesthai)." Again: "They [the soldiers] marched a whole day through the water PLUNGED IN (baptizomenori) up to the waist" Once more: "The bitumen floats on the top [of the lake Sirbon], because of the nature of the water, which admits of no diving; nor can anyone who enters it PLUNGE IN (baptizesthai), but is borne up."

JOSEPHUS, who died A. D. 93, aged fifty-six, and was therefore contemporary with the apostles, "speaking of the ship in which Jonah was, says: Mellontos baptizesthai tou skaphous the ship being about TO SINK." In the history of his own life, "speaking of a voyage to Rome, during which the ship that carried him foundered in the Adriatic, he says: Our ship being IMMERSED or SINKING in the Adriatic. Speaking of Aristobulus as having been drowned by command of Herod, he says: The boy was sent to Jericho, and there, agreeably to command, being IMMERSED in a pond (baptizo menos en columbeethra), he perished."

PLUTARCH, who died about A. D. 140, refers to a Roman general "DIPPING (baptisas) his hand into blood," etc. Again: "PLUNGE (baptison) yourself into the sea."

LUCIAN, who died A. D. 180, represents Timon, the man-hater, as saying: "If a, winter's flood should carry away any one, and he, stretching out his hands, should beg for help, I would press down the head of such an one when SINKING (baptizonta), so that he could not rise again" The reader, by referring to Professor Stuart's treatise on the Mode of Baptism (pp. 14-20), can test the accuracy of these quotations. I might add to their number, but these are sufficient. It will be seen that I have used Roman instead of Greek letters. This has been done for the satisfaction of a large majority of those who will read these pages.

"Immerse" is clearly the classical meaning of baptizo. In all the preceding extracts it might with propriety be employed. A "sinking ship," for example, is a ship about to be immersed. Nor is it any abuse of language to say that places "not overflowed" are not immersed. I solicit special attention to the fact that, of the Greek authors referred to, some lived before the coming of Christ, some during the apostolic age, and others at a period subsequent to that age. Seven hundred years intervened between the birth of Pindar and the death of Lucian. During those seven centuries usage shows that baptizo meant "to immerse." Most of the classic Greek writers lived before baptism was instituted, and knew nothing of immersion as a religious ordinance; those who lived after its institution cared nothing for it. There was no controversy as to the meaning of baptizo during the classic period of Grecian history; there was no motive, therefore, that could so influence Greek writers as to induce them to use the word in any but its authorized sense. That sense was most obviously "to immerse." Even Dr. Edward Beecher, though carried away with the notion that baptizo, "in its religious sense," means "to purify," admits that in classic usage it signifies "to immerse." He says: "I freely admit that in numerous cases it clearly denotes 'to immerse' in which

case an agent submerges partially or totally some person or thing. Indeed, this is so notoriously true that I need attempt no proof. Innumerable examples are at hand.” [Note: Beecher On Baptism, p. 9. 10] No man of established reputation as a Greek scholar will deny that baptizo, at the beginning of the Christian era, meant “to immerse,” and that usage had confirmed that meaning. Dr. Doddridge virtually admits this to be its import in the New Testament when used as descriptive of the sufferings of Christ. Hence he paraphrases Luke 12:50 thus: “But I have, indeed, in the meantime, a most dreadful baptism to be baptized with, and know that I shall shortly be bathed, as it were, in blood, and plunged in the most overwhelming distress.” [Note: Family Expositor, p. 204.] Baptizo literally means “immerse,” and therefore in its figurative application it is used to denote an immersion in sorrow, suffering, and affliction. But some say that though baptizo, in classic Greek, means “to immerse,” it does not follow that it is to be understood in this sense in the New Testament. They discourse learnedly on the difference between classic and sacred Greek. They insist that baptizo has in the Scriptures a theological sense. In short, they forget what they have learned from Ernesti’s Principles of Interpretation namely, that “when God has spoken to men he has spoken in the language of men, for he has spoken by men and for men.” For the benefit of these ingenious critics, I quote from an able Methodist work on theology. The author is showing, in opposition to the Socinian view that ‘the apostles, in referring to the death of Christ, employ terms which convey the idea of expiation. He says: “The use to be made of this in the argument is that, as the apostles found the very terms they used with reference to the nature and efficacy of the death of Christ fixed in an expiatory signification among the Greeks, they could not, in honesty, use them in a distant figurative sense, much less in a contrary one, without due notice of their having invested them with a new import being given to their readers ... In like manner, the Jews had their expiatory sacrifices, and the terms and phrases used in them are, in like manner, employed by the apostles to characterize the death of their Lord; and they would have been as guilty of misleading their Jewish as their Gentile readers had they employed them in a new sense and without warning, which, unquestionably, they never gave.” [Note: Richard Watson’s Theological Institutes, vol. 2, p. 151.] Dr. Hodge, in his Way of Life, expresses the same view. To all this I cordially subscribe. The apostles found in use among the people certain terms which conveyed to their minds the idea of expiation. They used those terms, and evidently in that sense. As honest men they could not do otherwise without giving information of the fact. So reasons the accomplished Richard Watson. Very well. The same apostles found the term baptizo fixed in its meaning, and that meaning was “to immerse.” Could they, then, “in honesty,” employ it to denote “sprinkle” and “pour” without notifying their readers of the fact? Dr. Watson being judge, they could not. “Unquestionably,” they never intimated to Jew or Gentile that they used the word in a new sense. Now, I insist that Methodists ought either to admit the validity of this argument in reference to baptizo or reject as inconclusive the reasoning against Socinians. It is to be remembered, also, that those who say that the scriptural meaning of baptizo differs from its classic meaning must prove it; the burden of proof is on them. If they say it means “to sprinkle,” let them show it; if they affirm that it means “to pour,” let them establish this signification. If Dr. Beecher can do anything for his “purification theory,” let him do it. Baptists occupy a position which commends itself to every unprejudiced mind. They say that baptizo, among the Greeks, meant “to immerse,” and that John the Baptist, Christ, and the apostles used it in the same sense and just as the people understood it. I think it has now been shown that the classical meaning of baptizo is “immerse,” and that it is perfectly gratuitous to assert that its scriptural meaning differs from its classical import.

SECTION IV. The design of baptism furnishes an argument in favor of the position of Baptists. In the ordinance of baptism there is a profession of faith in Jesus Christ, as we may learn from Ephesians 4:5 : "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." The term "Lord" in this passage, as is generally the case in the Epistles, refers to Christ. He, having died and risen again, is presented in the gospel as the Object of faith and the Author of salvation. Faith is a trustful acceptance of Christ as the Saviour. On a profession of this "one faith" in the "one Lord," the "one baptism" is administered. Baptism is therefore a profession of faith. Take away the "one Lord," and the "one faith," becomes vain, for there is no object of faith) and the "one baptism" is vain also, for there is no faith of which it is the profession. If we transpose the terms of the passage, we see that the transposition is ruinous. If we put faith before the Lord, and baptism before faith, we invert the inspired order. If changed, the order is virtually abolished. Of baptism it may be said that it represents the burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ. This we learn from the following passages: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried [Greek, were buried] with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection;" "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead;" "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God), by the resurrection of Jesus Christ" (Romans 6:3-5; Colossians 2:12; 1 Peter 3:21).

It is clear from these passages that baptism has a commemorative reference to the burial and resurrection of Christ. The two ordinances of the gospel symbolically proclaim its three great facts. These facts, as Paul teaches (1 Corinthians 15:3-4), are that Christ died, was buried, and rose again. The Lord's Supper commemorates the first fact; all are agreed in this view. At his Table the disciples of Christ are solemnly reminded of his death. They weep over him as crucified dead. In baptism they see him buried and raised again, just as they see him dead in the sacred Supper. Baptism is therefore a symbolic proclamation of two of the three prominent gospel facts the burial and the resurrection of Christ. These facts are infinitely worthy of commemoration, and they are properly commemorated when the ordinances of the New Testament are observed according to their original design. This by the way.

Baptism also expresses in emblem the believer's death to sin and resurrection to "newness of life." In "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ" there occurs a spiritual death to sin, followed by a spiritual resurrection to a new life. These two facts are emblematically set forth in baptism. Hence the absurdity of baptizing any who are not dead to sin. We are baptized into the death of Christ. We profess our reliance on his death for salvation; and we profess also that, as he died for sin, we have died to sin. As burial is a palpable separation of the dead from the living, so baptism is a symbolic separation of those dead to sin from those living in sin. As a resurrection from the dead indicates an entrance into a new sphere of existence, so baptism, in its similitude to a resurrection, denotes an entrance upon a new life. Dr. Chalmers, therefore, in his lecture on Romans 6:3-7, remarks that we "are conceived, in the act of descending under the water of baptism, to have resigned an old life, and in the act of ascending to emerge into a second or new life." There is an emblematic renunciation of "the old life," and there is an emblematic introduction

into “the new life.” William Tyndale very appropriately says, “The plunging into the water signifieth that we die and are buried with Christ as concerning the old life of sin, which is Adam. And the pulling out again signifieth that we rise again with Christ in a new life, full of the Holy Ghost,”

If baptism is a symbol of death to sin, it is of necessity a symbol of regeneration, because death to sin is involved in regeneration. In the words “washing of regeneration” the abstract is probably used for the concrete, the meaning being “the washing of the regenerate.” The much-controverted phrase “born of water” seems to refer to baptism. Burial in baptism has respect to immersion in water, while “born of water” literally, “out of water” has respect to emersion out of the watery envelopment which constitutes the symbolic burial. If baptism is a symbol of regeneration, it follows that regeneration must precede it; for otherwise nothing would be symbolized. If, as some suppose, baptism effects regeneration, or is regeneration, then it cannot be a symbol; for no symbol can produce that which it symbolizes, and no symbol can symbolize itself. In other words, the thing symbolized must have an existence, or there is no place for a symbol. This is plain to those who understand the philosophy of symbols.

Baptism is likewise a symbol of remission of sins, the washing away of sins, and moral purification. We therefore read in Acts 2:38, “Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins.” Many scriptures teach that sins are actually, really, remitted when the sinner believes in Christ; but there is a symbolic, formal, declarative remission in baptism. If sins are remitted when we believe in Christ, and if they are remitted when we are baptized, it is certain that the two remissions are not the same. The one is real, the other is symbolic. In the language addressed to Saul of Tarsus (Acts 22:16) “Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord” there is not so much a contemplation of sins in the light of crimes needing remission as in the aspect of pollutions needing to be washed away. There is an actual washing away of sins in the blood of Christ when faith unites the soul to him; but there is a symbolic washing away of sins in the baptismal waters. When our bodies are said to be washed “with pure water,” baptism is referred to as the symbol of moral purification. The symbol has to do with the body, “the outer man,” because the soul, “the inner man,” has been washed in the blood of Jesus. The outward cleansing follows the inward purification.

Baptism likewise anticipates the believer’s resurrection from the dead. This we learn from 1 Corinthians 15:29 : “Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?” These questions are to be found in an argument of matchless power and beauty on the resurrection of the dead. Some of the Corinthians, it seems, denied the doctrine of the resurrection, yet it does not appear that they questioned the propriety of the observance of the ordinance of baptism. Paul virtually tells them that baptism has an anticipatory reference to the resurrection on the last day. It has this reference because it has a commemorative reference to the resurrection of Christ. It anticipates because it commemorates. The reason is obvious. The resurrection of the Lord Jesus procures the resurrection of his followers, and is an infallible pledge of it. The two resurrections are inseparable. Baptism, therefore, while it commemorates the resurrection of Christ, anticipates, of necessity, the resurrection of believers. Dr. Adam Clarke, distinguished among Methodists, in his comment on the verse under consideration, says: “The sum of the apostle’s meaning appears to be this: If there be no resurrection of the dead, those who, in becoming Christians, expose themselves to all manner of privations, crosses, severe sufferings, and a violent death, can have no compensation,

nor any motive sufficient to induce them to expose themselves to such miseries. But as they receive baptism as an emblem of death in voluntarily going under the water, so they receive it as an emblem of the resurrection unto eternal life in coming up out of the water: thus they are baptized for the dead) in perfect faith of the resurrection.” That Dr. Clarke has given the meaning of this controverted passage there is, in my judgment, no ground for reasonable doubt.

Now, if these views of the design and the emblematic import of baptism are correct, it follows inevitably that the immersion in water of a believer in Christ is essential to baptism so essential that without it there is no baptism. If baptism represents the burial and the resurrection of Christ, it must be immersion. Do the sprinkling and the pouring of water bear any resemblance to a burial and a resurrection? Absolutely none. Immersion, however, bears a striking resemblance to a burial and a resurrection. We are “buried by baptism” that is, by means of baptism. When the baptismal act is performed, there is a burial. The two things are inseparable, and therefore where there is no “burial” there is no baptism. Were it necessary, I might show that Wall, Whitefield, Wesley, Doddridge, Chalmers, Macknight, Bloorneld, Barnes, and many others all of them Pedobaptists admit that the phrase “buried by baptism” alludes to immersion. Some learned men, however, insist that there is no reference to “water baptism.” “Spiritual baptism,” say they, “is referred to.” They think to nullify in this way the argument for immersion. But do they accomplish their object? Let us see. I will meet them on their own chosen ground. Let it be conceded, then, for argument’s sake, that “buried by baptism” denotes spiritual baptism. Then there is a spiritual burial. Now, it is a well-settled point among Pedobaptists that the outward baptism is a sign of the inward. If, then, the inward baptism involves a spiritual burial, the outward baptism must involve a burial in water that it may represent the inward. Men may torture and put to the rack the phrase “buried by baptism,” but it will testify of immersion. It cannot be divested of its reference to Christian immersion. To conclude the argument from the design of baptism: How stands the matter? If baptism commemorates the burial and the resurrection of Christ, it must be immersion. If it is an emblematic representation of death to sin and resurrection to newness of life, the representation is essentially incomplete without immersion. If it symbolizes the remission of sins, the washing away of sins, and moral purification, the purposes of the symbol require immersion. The fulness of the remission, the thoroughness of the washing, and the completeness of the purification demand an act affecting the whole body. If there is something in baptism that anticipates and resembles the resurrection of the dead, still it must be immersion. Sprinkling and pouring are as unlike a resurrection as they are unlike a burial.

Let baptism be considered a representation of the facts illustrated in the design of the ordinance, and it will appear not only an impressive symbol, but a combination of symbols as beautiful as they are solemn. If another form of expression is preferred, it may be said that kindred elements come together and constitute the symbol. In immersion alone is there a recognition of these elements, and therefore immersion alone is the symbol. No act but immersion in water, followed by emersion out of water, meets the demands of the symbol. Any other act vitiates the symbolic import of baptism.

SECTION V. The places selected for the administration of baptism and the circumstances attending its administration, as referred to in the New Testament, supply an additional argument in proof of the position of Baptists.

John baptized in Jordan. That the Jordan is a suitable stream for purposes of immersion is manifest from the testimony of one of the most distinguished of modern travellers and scholars, Dr. Edward Robinson.

Speaking of the Jordan, he says, "We estimated the breadth of the stream to be from eighty to one hundred feet. The guides supposed it to be now ten or twelve feet deep. I bathed in the river without going out into the deep channel." [Note: Biblical Researches 'in Palestine, vol. 2, p. 256.]

Even Dr. Lightfoot, who was quite conspicuous in his opposition to immersion in the Westminster Assembly, uses the following language: "That the baptism of John was by plunging the body seems to appear from those things which are related of him namely, that he baptized in Jordan; that he baptized in Enon, because there was much water there; and that Christ, being baptized, came up out of the water; to which that seems to be parallel (Acts 8:38), "Philip and the eunuch went down into the water?" [Note: Quoted in Dr. Adam Clarke's Commentary, vol. 5, p. 325.]

I am aware that Pedobaptists many of them, at least argue that John's was not Christian baptism, that he did not live under the Christian Dispensation, etc. Dissenting most earnestly from these views, I waive a consideration of them as foreign to my present purpose. It is sufficient for me to say that even if it could be shown that John's was not Christian baptism it would avail Pedobaptists nothing. John performed an act called baptism, and various circumstances, as well as the meaning of the word, indicate that that act was immersion. Pedobaptists attempt to invalidate the force of those circumstances by denying that John administered Christian baptism. But they admit that the apostles, after the resurrection of Christ, administered Christian baptism. Very well. The same term used to designate the act performed by John is used to denote the act performed by them. It must therefore be the same act. Surely, no one will say that the word "baptize" means one thing in its connection with John's ministry and a different thing in connection with the ministry of the apostles. Hence I repeat that if it could be shown that John's was not Christian baptism it would amount to nothing.

There is another Pedobaptist view which requires notice. It is that Christ was baptized to initiate him into the priestly office. A few questions will place this matter in its proper light: Was not Christ "made a priest after the order of Melchisedec, and not after the order of Aaron"? How could he be a priest according to the law of Moses, when he was of the "tribe of Judah"? Was not the priestly office confined to the tribe of Levi, and to the family of Aaron in that tribe? Did not the law say, "The stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death"? All that Pedobaptists say about the baptismal initiation of Christ into the priestly office is at war with the Scriptures. Why this attempt to show that the Saviour was made a priest by his baptism? The object seems to be to evade the moral power of his example; for no man who will lay aside his prejudices can deny that Jesus was immersed in the Jordan. But if the people can be made to believe that the baptism of Christ had reference to his priestly consecration, they will feel comparatively exempt from obligation to follow his example, as they are not baptized that they may become priests. Jesus, in his baptism as well as in other respects, has "left us an example that we should follow his steps"

Returning from this apparent digression, I may say again that the Jordan was unquestionably a suitable stream for purposes of immersion; that John baptized in it; and that Jesus, when baptized, "went up straightway out of the water." John also baptized "in Enon near to Salim" (John 3:23). Why? Let Dr. Miller answer. He says: "Independently of immersion altogether, plentiful streams of

water were absolutely necessary for the constant refreshment and sustenance of the many thousands who were encamped from day to day to witness the preaching and the baptism of this extraordinary man; together with the beasts employed for their transportation. Only figure to yourselves a large encampment of men, women, and children, etc ... As a poor man who lived in the wilderness, whose raiment was of the meanest kind, and whose food was such alone as the desert afforded, it is not to be supposed that he possessed appropriate vessels for administering baptism to multitudes by pouring or sprinkling. He therefore seems to have made use of the neighboring stream of water for this purpose, descending its banks and setting his feet on its margin, so as to admit of his using a handful to answer the symbolic purpose intended by the application of water in baptism." [Note: Miller On Baptism: Four Discourses, pp. 92, 93. 11]

What to call this extract I do not know. It seems to be a mixture of assertion, supposition, and fiction. Where did Dr. Miller learn that "plentiful streams of water were absolutely necessary" for the purposes which he specifies? What he says about "a large encampment" must have been a day-dream, as also his reference to "beasts" and "transportation." The evangelists say nothing of the "encampment" and make no allusion to the "beasts." Poverty is an inconvenience, but not a crime; and I therefore take no offence at the reference to the indigence of the first Baptist preacher. It may, however, be questioned whether John was not able to own "appropriate vessels" for purposes of "pouring or sprinkling." But, admitting his extreme poverty when he went to the Jordan to baptize, he then became so popular that an intimation from him that he needed "appropriate vessels" would have secured as many as the "beasts" could transport. Why did he not, then, get "vessels" and supersede the necessity of his going to the Jordan, and to "Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there"? Would not Herod also have furnished "appropriate vessels" at the time when he "did many things, and heard John gladly"?

Dr. N. L. Rice, having been a pupil of Dr. Miller, adopted his view of the matter before us. He therefore, in his Debate with Alexander Campbell (p. 193), uses these words: "John, it is true, was baptizing in Enon near Salim, because there was much water there. But did he want much water to baptize in, or did he want it for other purposes? As I have already stated, multitudes of the Jews who resorted to him remained together several days at a time. They must observe their daily ablutions. For these and for ordinary purposes they needed much water; but it cannot be proved that John wanted the water for the purpose of baptizing."

Theologians should, of course, be wise men, but they ought not to be "wise above that which is written." Where did Dr. Rice learn that the "multitudes" who went to John "remained together several days"? Who told him about those "daily ablutions"? By what sort of logic can it be shown that the Jews "needed much water" for other purposes, but not for baptismal purposes, when baptism is the only thing requiring water mentioned in the controverted passage?

It is humiliating to know that such men as Drs. Miller and Rice have used the language that has been quoted. Let modern teachers now keep silence, and let an evangelist speak. What does he say? Here are his inspired words: "And John also was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there: and they came, and were baptized" (John 3:23). Is there anything here about "encampments," "beasts," "daily ablutions," etc. Did not the people go to John to be baptized? not to encamp, not to provide water for their "beasts," not to "observe their daily ablutions." Did not John select Enon as a suitable place for his purpose "because there was much

water there"? Did he not need "much water" in baptizing? and is not this a strong argument in favor of immersion? No act performed on the body requires so "much water" as the act of immersing in water. I write in plainness and in sorrow when I say that those who expound the passage under consideration as Drs. Miller and Rice have done assign a reason for John's selection of Enon as a baptismal place which the Holy Spirit has not assigned. The doing of such a thing involves fearful responsibility. To demolish all that has ever been said about John's selecting places where there was "much water" for other than baptismal purposes, I need only state a few facts. We are told that in the early part of the Saviour's ministry "great multitudes followed him" subsequently, he miraculously fed "four thousand," and at another time "five thousand men, besides women and children;" and on another occasion "there were gathered together an innumerable multitude of people, insomuch that they trod one upon another." But there was nothing said about water. It is not said that Jesus, "seeing the multitudes," went where there was "much water," that the people might be refreshed, but "he went up into a mountain." Was he less considerate than was John of the comfort of the crowds that attended him. We cannot believe it. Still, there is nothing said about "much water" in connection with the multitudes that gathered around him. But we are told of "much water" in the account given of John's baptism in Enon. He "was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there." It is vain, and worse than vain, to deny that "much water" was required in baptism. This would not have been the case if baptism had not been immersion. Of the many acts popularly called baptism, there is only one the act of immersion that requires "much water;" and it is certain that this is the act performed by John the Baptist. The baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch, as recorded in Acts 8:38-39, is worthy of special notice. The sacred historian says, "And they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him j" "And when they were come up out of the water," etc. It has been often said that going into the water does not necessarily imply immersion. This is true. It is possible to go "down into water" and "come up out of water" without being immersed. But suppose, as in the case before us, between the two movements the act of baptism occurs. What then? Evidently the word "baptize" must determine the nature of that act. This is the view held by Baptists. They say, with strongest emphasis, that the term "baptize" shows what act Philip performed after he went down with the eunuch into the water j and they confidently appeal to all Greek literature, secular and sacred, in support of the position that baptizo means "to immerse." Hence they would be as fully satisfied as they now are of the eunuch's immersion if not one word had been said about the descent into the water. Still, they regard the going down into the water and the coming up out of the water as furnishing a very strong circumstantial proof of immersion. They assume that Philip and the eunuch were men of good sense, and therefore did not go into the water for purposes of "pouring or sprinkling." But it is often said that the Greek preposition eis, translated "into," means "to," and that Philip and the eunuch went only to the water. As sensible men they would not have done this if sprinkling or pouring had been the act to be performed. With reference to this little word eis, Dr. Summers, in his book *On Baptism* (p. 100), says: "When eis means e into/ it is used before the noun as well as before the verb." The argument based on this statement is that, as eis is used but once in Acts 8:38, Philip and the eunuch did not go into, but only to, the water; and the conclusion is that "the eunuch was not immersed."

I concede everything which truth requires me to concede to Dr. Summers. It is true that when entrance into a place or thing is denoted eis is frequently used twice once in composition with the verb, and once before the noun or pronoun j but in numberless instances it is used but once to

express the same idea of entrance. Let any Greek scholar turn to Matthew 2:11-14; Matthew 2:20-22, and he will find eis but once in the phrases “into the house,” “into their own country” “into Egypt,” “into the land of Israel,” and “into the parts of Galilee.” If, then, Dr. Summers’s statement is true without qualification, the “wise men” did not go “into the house” and did not return “into their own country,” nor was Joseph required to “flee into Egypt” and to “go into the land of Israel.”

Again, if Dr. Summers is right in his assertion, the demons referred to in Matthew 8:31-33 did not enter “into the swine,” and the swine did not run “into the sea,” and the keepers of the swine did not go “into the city.” In all these places eis is used but once. It seems, also, that the Saviour, in Matthew 9:17, did not speak of putting wine into bottles, but only to bottles; for eis is used but once. Query: How could the “new wine” break the “old bottles” without being put into them? Once more: It is said in Matthew 25:46, “And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.” Here, also, eis is used but once; and, according to Dr. Summers and many others, the wicked do not go “into everlasting punishment” nor the righteous “into life eternal.” But in these passages Pedobaptists very readily admit that eis means “into.” They have no objection to this meaning unless baptismal waters are referred to. This little word eis is a strange word indeed if all said of it is true. It will take a man into a country, into a city, into a house, into a ship, into heaven, into hell into any place in the universe except the water. Poor word! Afflicted, it seems, with hydrophobia, it will allow a person to go to the water, but not into it. However, where baptism is not referred to, it may denote entrance into water, as in Mark 9:22 : “And oftentimes it hath cast him into the fire and into the waters to destroy him.” Unfortunate boy! that eis, though used but once, thrust him “into the fire and into the waters.”

Pedobaptists are very unreasonable in their management of the baptismal controversy. They insist that it is utterly improbable that water could be found in Jerusalem for the immersion of three thousand persons on the day of Pentecost that there is no mention of a stream of water in connection with the baptism of Saul of Tarsus and the jailer. One would imagine that if there was anything said about “a river” “much water,” something would be at once conceded in favor of immersion. But not so. For when Baptists refer to the Jordan or Enon, where there was “much water” or to the water into which Philip and the eunuch went down, Pedobaptists argue that an abundance of water by no means indicates that the act of immersion was performed. We cannot please them at all. They are like the Jewish children in the market-places. If we pipe to them, they will not dance; if we mourn to them, they will not lament. If there is no mention of a “river” in a baptismal narrative of the New Testament, the cry is, “No immersion” and “Scarcity of water.” If the river Jordan is named, the same cry of “No immersion” is heard; so that, according to Pedobaptist logic, scarcity of water and abundance of water prove the same thing! How are we to meet in argument men who draw the same conclusion from premises as far apart as “from the centre thrice to the utmost pole”?

John Calvin felt the force of the argument in favor of immersion derived from the places selected for the administration of baptism. Hence, in his commentary (translated by Rev. William Pringle, Edinburgh, and printed for the Calvin Translation Society), he remarks on John 3:22-23 : “From these words we may infer that John and Christ administered baptism by plunging the whole body beneath the water.” On Acts 8:38 he says: “Here we see the rite used among the men of old time in baptism; for they put all the body into the water. Now, the use is this, that the minister doth only sprinkle the body or the head. But we ought not to stand so much about a small difference of a

ceremony that we should therefore divide the church or trouble the same with brawls. Wherefore the church did grant liberty to herself since the beginning to change the rites somewhat, excepting the substance.” So much for the testimony of the great Calvin.

Before proceeding to the historical argument for immersion, I will say that if baptizo means “to immerse,” it does not mean “sprinkle” or “pour.” If it means “sprinkle,” it does not mean “immerse” or “pour.” If it means “pour,” it does not mean “sprinkle” or “immerse.” It is at war with the philosophy of language to say that the word can denote three acts so dissimilar. Did not Jesus Christ, in enjoining baptism, give a specific command? If he did not, it is impossible to know what he requires, and the impossibility releases from all obligation to obey the requirement. I say boldly that it is not the duty of any man to be baptized if he cannot know what baptism is. All candid persons must admit that the Saviour gave a specific command when he enjoined baptism on believers. If so, he did not require them to be immersed in water, or that water be sprinkled or poured on them. He did not require any one of three things; for on this supposition the command loses its specific character. The matter, then, comes to this point: Did Christ require believers to be immersed in water, or to have water applied to them by sprinkling or pouring?

Now, if the word “baptize” in the New Testament means “sprinkle” or “pour,” as Pedobaptists insist, and if baptism is an “application of water,” is it not very remarkable that water is never said to be baptized upon the subjects of the ordinance, and never said to be applied? If “baptize” means “to sprinkle” or “pour,” the water is baptized, not the person.

We cannot speak of sprinkling a man without an ellipsis or figure of speech; and no one would expect an ellipsis or figure of speech in the Apostolic Commission. Sprinkling implies the separation and scattering of the particles of the substance sprinkled. A man cannot be poured, because pouring implies a continuous stream of the substance poured. I say, again, that if “baptize” in the New Testament means “sprinkle” or “pour,” the water is baptized. But nowhere is water found in the objective case after the verb “baptize” in the active voice, and nowhere is it the subject of the verb in the passive voice. We never read, “I baptize water upon you,” but, “I baptize you.” It is never said that water was baptized upon them, but it is said that “they were baptized, both men and women.” The subjects of the ordinance are baptized, the water is not; and therefore “baptize” in the New Testament signifies neither “sprinkle” nor “pour.” But substitute “immerse” for it, and how plain and beautiful is every baptismal narrative! I immerse you, not the water. They were immersed that is, the “men and women.” The plainness of this view renders a further elucidation of the point needless.

SECTION VI.

History bears testimony to the practice of immersion, except in cases of sickness and urgent necessity, for more than thirteen hundred years.

I avail myself, as I have already done, of Pedobaptist witnesses. My first witness is Richard Baxter, author of the Saint’s Rest. He says, “It is commonly confessed by us to the Anabaptists, as our commentators declare, that in the apostles’ times the baptized were dipped over head in the water, and that this signified their profession both of believing the burial and resurrection of Christ, and of their own present renouncing the world and flesh, or dying to sin and living to Christ, or rising again to newness of life, or being buried and risen again with Christ, as the apostle expoundeth in

the fore cited texts of Colossians 2 and Romans 6. [Note: Quoted in Booth's *Pedobaptism Examined*] The celebrated Dr. Samuel Johnson refers to the Roman Catholics as in the Lord's Supper giving the bread to the laity and withholding the cup from them. He says, "They may think that in what is merely ritual, deviations from the primitive mode may be admitted on the ground of convenience; and I think they are as well warranted to make this alteration as we are to substitute sprinkling in the room of the ancient baptism." [Note: *Boswell's Life of Johnson*, vol. 2, p. 383.]

John Wesley, in his *Journal* of Feb. 21, 1736, writes as follows: "Mary Welsh, aged eleven days, was baptized, according to the custom of the first church and the rule of the Church of England, by immersion."

Dr. Miller, with his bitter opposition to immersion, says: "It is not denied that for the first few centuries after Christ the most common mode of administering baptism was by immersion." [Note: *Sermons on Baptism*, p. 116.] The learned Mosheim, in his *Church History*, says of the first century: "The sacrament of baptism was administered in this century, without the public assemblies, in places appointed and prepared for that purpose, and was performed by an immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font." Of the second century he says: "The persons that were to be baptized, after they had repeated the Creed, confessed and renounced their sins, and particularly the devil and his pompous allurements, were immersed under water and received into Christ's kingdom." Of the fourth century he writes thus: "Baptismal fonts were now erected in the porch of each church, for the more commodious administration of that initiating sacrament." [Note: *Maclaine's Mosheim* (in two vols.), vol. 1, pp. 46, 69, 121. 12] The celebrated church historian Neander, in his letter to .Rev. Willard Judd, expresses himself thus: "As to your question on the original rite of baptism, there can be no doubt whatever that in the primitive times the ceremony was performed by immersion, to signify a complete immersion into the new principle of life divine which was to be imparted by the Messiah. When St. Paul says that through baptism we are buried with Christ, and rise again with him, he unquestionably alludes to the symbol of dipping into, and rising again out of, the water. The practice of immersion in the first centuries was beyond all doubt prevalent in the whole church; the only exception was made with the baptism of the sick, hence termed *baptisma clinicorum*, which was performed merely by sprinkling." [Note: See Appendix to Judd's *Review of Stuart*.] I might quote other testimony like this from Neander's *Church History* and his *Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, but the foregoing from the great Lutheran is sufficient.

Dr. "Whitby of the Church of England, in his commentary, says on Romans 6:4, "It being so expressly declared here and in Colossians 2:12 that we are 'buried with Christ in baptism' by being buried under water, and the argument to oblige us to a conformity to his death by dying to sin being taken hence, and this immersion being religiously observed by all Christians for thirteen centuries, and approved by our church, and the change of it into sprinkling, even without any allowance from the Author of the institution, or any license from any Council of the church, being that which the Romanist still urgeth to justify his refusal of the cup to the laity, it were to be wished that this custom might be again of general use, and aspersion only permitted, as of old, in case of *clini* or those in present danger of death."

What says Professor Stuart? Quoting Augusti, who refers to the ancient practice of immersion as "a thing made out," he says: "So, indeed, all the writers who have thoroughly investigated this

subject conclude. I know of no one usage of ancient times which seems to be more clearly and certainly made out. I cannot see how it is possible for any candid man who examines the subject to deny this." Again: "The mode of baptism by immersion the Oriental Church has always continued to preserve, even down to the present time. The members of this church are accustomed to call the members of the Western churches sprinkled Christians, by way of ridicule and contempt. They maintain that baptizo can mean nothing but 'mini erge' and that 'baptism by sprinkling' is as great a solecism as * immersion by aspersion;' and they claim to themselves the honor of having preserved the ancient sacred rite of the church free from change and corruption which would destroy its significancy." [Note: Stuart On the Mode of Baptism, pp. 75-77.] As immersion was the general practice for more than thirteen hundred years, the reader may wish to know how it has been to so lamentable an extent superseded by sprinkling. The following quotations explain the matter.

Dr. Wall, in his History of Infant Baptism, speaking of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, which continued from A. D. 1558 to 1603, says: "It being allowed to weak children (tho' strong enough to be brought to church) to be baptized by affusion, many fond ladies and gentlewomen first, and then by degrees the common people, would obtain the favor of the priest to have their children pass for weak children too tender to endure dipping in water. Especially (as Mr. Walker observes) if some instance really were, or were but fancied or framed, of some child's taking hurt by it. And another thing that had a greater influence than this was: That many of our English divines and other people had, during Queen Mary's bloody reign, fled into Germany, Switzerland, etc., and, coming back in Queen Elizabeth's time, they brought with them a great love to the customs of those Protestant churches wherein they had sojourned. And especially the authority of Calvin, and the rules which he had established at Geneva, had a mighty influence on a great number of our people about that time. Now, Calvin had not only given his Dictate, in his Institutions, that the difference is of no moment, whether he that is baptised be dipt all over; and if so, whether thrice or once; or whether he be only wetted with the water poured on him: But he had also drawn up for the use of his church at Geneva (and afterward published to the world) a form of administering the sacraments where, when he comes to the order of baptizing, he words it thus: Then the minister of baptism pours water on the infant; saying, I baptize thee } etc. There had been, as I said, some Synods in some Dioceses of France that had spoken of affusion without mentioning immersion at all; that being the common practice: but for an Office or Liturgy of any church; this is, I believe the first in the world that prescribes affusion absolutely."

Dr. Wall also refers to the influence of the "Westminster Assembly in substituting pouring and sprinkling for immersion. That Assembly not only made a "Confession of Faith," but a "Directory for the Public Worship of God," in which "pouring or sprinkling" is declared "not only lawful, but sufficient and most expedient." Such a declaration surely would not have been made if "pouring" and "sprinkling" had not been of comparatively recent origin in England. This, however, by way of parenthesis. Dr. Wall says: "So (parallel to the rest of their reformations) they reformed the Font into a Basin. This Learned Assembly could not remember that Fonts to baptize in had been always used by the primitive Christians, long before the beginning of popery; and ever since churches were built: But that sprinkling, for the common use of baptizing, was really introduced (in France first, and then in other Popish countries) in times of Popery: And that accordingly all those countries in which the usurped power of the Pope is, or has formerly been, owned have left off

dipping of children in the Font: But that all other countries in the world (which had never regarded his authority) do still use it: And that Basins, except in case of necessity, were never used by Papists, or any other Christians whatsoever, till by themselves. The use was: The minister continuing in his reading Desk, the child was brought and held below him: And there was placed for that use a little Basin of water about the bigness of a syllabub pot, into which the minister dipping his fingers, and then holding his hand over the face of the child, some drops would fall from his fingers on the child's face. For the Directory says, it is not only lawful, but most expedient, to use pouring or sprinkling." *

I quote also, in vindication of the "truth of history," from the Edinburgh Encyclopaedia, edited by Sir David Brewster, a very distinguished Pedobaptist. It contains the following account of "sprinkling:" "The first law for sprinkling was obtained in the following manner: Pope Stephen II., being driven from Rome by Astolphus, King of the Lombards, in 753, fled to Pepin, who a short time before had usurped the crown of France. While he remained there the monks of Cressy, in Brittany, consulted him whether in case of necessity baptism performed by pouring water on the head of the infant would be lawful. Stephen replied that it would. But though the truth of this fact should be allowed which, however, some Catholics deny yet pouring or sprinkling was admitted only in cases of necessity. It was not till the year 1311 that the legislature, in a Council held at Ravenna, declared immersion or sprinkling to be indifferent. In this country [Scotland], however, sprinkling was never practised in ordinary cases till after the Reformation; and in England, even in the reign of Edward VI., trine immersion was commonly observed. But during the persecution of Mary many persons, most of whom were Scotsmen, fled from England to Geneva, and there greedily imbibed the opinions of that church. In 1556 a book was published at that place containing (The Form of Prayers and Ministration of Sacraments, approved by the famous and godly learned man, John Calvin/ in which the administrator is enjoined to take water in his hand and lay it on the child's forehead. These Scottish exiles, who had renounced the authority of the Pope, implicitly acknowledged the authority of Calvin, and, returning to their own country, with John Knox at their head, in 1559, established sprinkling in Scotland. From Scotland this practice made its way into England iii the reign of Elizabeth, but was not authorized by the Established Church." [Note: Article "Baptism."] My last quotation bearing on the history of baptism I make from Dean Stanley of the Church of England. In his article on "Baptism" in the Nineteenth Century for October, 1879, in referring to immersion, he says: "Even in the Church of England it is still observed in theory. Elizabeth and Edward VI. were both immersed. The rubric in the Public Baptism for Infants enjoins that, unless for special cases, they are to be dipped, not sprinkled. But in practice it gave way since the beginning of the seventeenth century. . The reason of the change is obvious. The practice of immersion, apostolic and primitive as it was, was peculiarly suitable to the southern and eastern countries, for which it was designed, and peculiarly unsuitable to the tastes, the convenience, and the feelings of the countries of the North and West. Not by any decree of Council or Parliament, but by the general sentiment of Christian liberty, this great change was effected. Not beginning till the thirteenth century, it has gradually driven the ancient Catholic usage out of the whole of Europe. There is no one who would now wish to go back to the old practice. It had, no doubt, the sanction of the apostles and of their Master. It had the sanction of the venerable churches of the early ages and of the sacred countries of the East. Baptism by sprinkling was rejected by the whole ancient church (except in the rare case of deathbeds or extreme necessity) as no baptism at all." In speaking of the decision of "the Christian civilized world" against

immersion, he says: "It is a striking example of the triumph of common sense and convenience over the bondage of form and custom. Perhaps no greater change has ever taken place in the outward form of Christian ceremony with such general agreement. It is a greater change even than that which the Roman Catholic Church has made in administering the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the bread without the wine. For that was a change which did not affect the thing that was signified; whereas the change from immersion to sprinkling has set aside the larger part of the apostolic language regarding baptism, and has altered the very meaning of the word."

Dean Stanley's testimony to historical facts can be safely accepted; but when he said that the change of immersion into sprinkling was a "triumph of common sense and convenience," his language can be accounted for in one way: he was what is termed a "Broad Churchman," and his views were quite elastic. There is no very great difference between a German Rationalist and an English Broad Churchman. It would be out of place now for me to enter into a descriptive detail of the opinions of either.

If I have not proved that immersion was practised for more than thirteen hundred years, except in cases of sickness and urgent necessity, I may well despair of proving anything. He who is not convinced by the testimony adduced in support of this fact would not be "persuaded though one should rise from the dead." What, then, is to be said of those Pedobaptists who assert that it cannot be proved that immersion was practised before the sixteenth century? They should study church history, and from it they would learn that until the last few hundred years immersion was the general rule, and aspersion the exception. They would learn that at one period the validity of a copious pouring of water on the entire persons of the sick on their beds, instead of baptism, was seriously called in question, and by some positively denied. They would ascertain that many more infants had been immersed in water than ever had water sprinkled or poured on them. The man who denies this fact knows very little about ecclesiastical history. Immersion, however, so far as infants are concerned, is no better than sprinkling. Neither is commanded in the word of God, and both belong to the large family of human traditions.

SECTION VII.

Pedobaptist objections answered.

These are numerous, and all of them cannot be referred to in a book like this. I will, however, refer to the most prominent objections that have come to my notice. They are the following:

1. It is said that John baptized) not in, but at Jordan.

Episcopalians and Methodists are precluded from a resort to this objection, for the "Book of Common Prayer" and the "Discipline" both teach that Jesus was baptized "in the Jordan." In all the range of Greek literature the preposition en, used in Matthew 3:6, and translated "in" means "in." Harrison, who is high authority on "Greek prepositions," refers to it as "the same with the Latin and English "in" (p. 243). It is a suggestive fact that our "in" comes to us through the Latin tongue from the Greek en. A child at a very early age learns what "in" means. To make the point before us plain it needs only to be said that John "baptized in the "wilderness." Here we have the same "in" representing the Greek en. How would it do to say that John baptized at the wilderness? The Greek is surely a strange language if it has no preposition meaning "in;" and if en has not this meaning, there is no word in the language that has. Let any Greek scholar try to express in Greek

the idea of being in a place, in a house, or in a river without the use of en. The meaning of en is “in,” as that of eis is “into;” and therefore it follows that John baptized in the Jordan, not at it.

2. John, it is said, baptized “with water”

It is insisted that “with water” implies that the water was applied in baptism. It is enough to say, in answer to this objection, that Baptists never immerse without water. John speaks of baptism in water, in the Holy Spirit, and in fire. King James’s translators probably rendered en “with” to make what they thought an emphatic distinction between the baptismal elements. They were wrong. Every scholar knows that the proper rendering is “in water.” The little preposition en here also acts a conspicuous part. It is as proper to say that John baptized with the wilderness and with the Jordan as that he baptized with water. In the first two instances en is translated “in,” and why should it be rendered “with” in the last? But, as I have said, Baptists do not immerse without water. If it is affirmed that the clothes were washed with water, does it follow that they were not dipped into it? Surely not.

3. It is urged with great confidence that three thousand persons could not have been immersed on the day of Pentecost,

It is supposed that there was not sufficient water for the purpose. Indeed! Where now is the “much water” that Dr. Rice found necessary for the “daily ablutions” of the Jews? They certainly performed their “ablutions” at home if they could not be dispensed with when they went to John’s baptism. Jerusalem, according to Dr. Edward Robinson, “would appear always to have had a full supply of water for its inhabitants, both in ancient and modern times. In the numerous sieges to which, in all ages, it has been exposed, We nowhere read of any want of water within the city.” [Note: Biblical Researches in Palestine, vol. 1, p. 479. 13] Where people can live, there is sufficient water for purposes of immersion. But why dwell on this point? If Jerusalem had been situated on the Mediterranean Sea, many Pedobaptists would not permit eis to take the three thousand converts into its waters. They are no more willing to admit immersion where there is an abundance of water than where there is a supposed scarcity. But it is insisted that it was impossible, even if there was water enough, for three thousand to be immersed in one day, and that therefore water must have been sprinkled or poured on them. I answer that it takes about as much time to sprinkle or pour as to immerse. Much the greater portion of time, in modern baptisms, is occupied in repeating the words of the baptismal ceremony. If it is said that sprinkling or pouring was more expeditiously performed in ancient than in modern times, I have an equal right to say the same thing of immersion. If the apostles alone baptized on the day of Pentecost (which, however, cannot be proved), they could have immersed the three thousand. If Pedobaptists deny this, let them account for the historical fact that Austin, the monk sent by Pope Gregory the Great into England in the year 597, “consecrated the river Swale, near York, in which he caused ten thousand of his converts to be baptized in one day.” They were immersed.

4. It is thought to militate against immersion that the Holy Spirit is said to be poured out.

If so, it militates equally against sprinkling. If pouring is baptism, why is not the Spirit sometimes said to be baptized? He is said to be poured out. There is as much difference between the pouring out of the Spirit and baptism in the Spirit as there is between the pouring of water into a baptistery and the immersion of a person in that water. Those baptized “with the Holy Spirit” or, rather, “in the

Holy Spirit” are placed under the influence of the Spirit, just as a person baptized in water is put under the influence of the water. It is the prerogative of Christ to baptize in the Holy Spirit, If, as Pedobaptists insist, pouring is baptism because the Holy Spirit is said to be poured out, what follows? Why, that as the Spirit is said to be “given,” to “testify” to “fill,” and to “speak,” therefore giving, testifying, filling, speaking, are all baptism! This, surely, will not be claimed.

5. Saul of Tarsus, it is affirmed, was baptized standing up. The argument assumes that when it is said (Acts 9:18) that Saul “arose and was baptized,” the meaning is he “stood up and was baptized.” In the Greek the participle *anastas* is used, and it comes from a verb found in the New Testament more than a hundred times, rendered in a few places “stood up,” and in a hundred places “rise,” “arise,” or “raise.” Wherever “stood up” is found, “arose” would be just as good a translation. Let it be admitted, however, that the word is properly rendered “stand up” in certain passages; still, it is undeniable that it is used in other passages to denote the beginning of a process by which a thing is done. Two examples will be sufficient. It is said (Luke 1:39), “And Mary arose [*anastasa*, same word with a feminine termination] in those days, and went into the hill-country,” etc. Did Mary stand up and go? Does not *anastasa* here indicate the beginning of the movement by which she reached “the hill country”? In Luke 15:18 the prodigal son says, “I will arise [*anastas*] and go to my father;” and in Luke 15:20 it is said “And he arose [*anastas*] and came to his father.” Did he stand up and go to his father? Was not the *anastas* the commencement of the returning movement? He arose and returned to his father. Now, Luke wrote the Acts of the Apostles. Is it not reasonable, then, to believe that when he says (Acts 9:18) that Saul “arose [*anastas*] and was baptized,” he means by *anastas* the beginning of a process necessary to his baptism? He evidently arose that he might be immersed; but no rising up, no *anastas*, was necessary if water was to be poured or sprinkled on him. His immersion implied the movement indicated by *anastas*, while pouring or sprinkling could imply no such movement. In Acts 9:39 of the same chapter it is said, “And Peter arose [*anastas*] and went with them “that is, to Joppa. He did not stand still and go, but he arose as the first thing to be done in getting to Joppa just as Saul arose as the first thing to be done in getting to a suitable place for immersion. But I shall let Saul, who afterward became Paul, settle this matter himself. In Romans 6:4, including himself with those to whom he wrote, he says: “We are [were] buried with him by baptism.” If Saul was buried by baptism, he was immersed. There is no burial in pouring or sprinkling.

6. It is argued that the question (Acts 10:47), “Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized?” intimates that water was to be brought. This objection to immersion is specially destitute of force. The question only means, Can anyone forbid the baptism of these Gentiles, who have received the Holy Spirit as well as the Jews? Baptist ministers, in receiving candidates for baptism, often say to the church, “Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized?” Does this imply that the water is to be brought in a “bowl” or a “pitcher”? Evidently not.

7. It is supposed that the jailer (Acts 16:30-34) could not have been immersed in prison.

Baptists do not say that he was immersed in prison. The jailer brought out Paul and Silas from the prison before he said, “Sirs, what must I do to be saved?” Then they “spoke to him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house.” It seems, then, that they were in his house (Acts 16:32). In Acts 16:34 it is said, “And when he had brought them into his house,” etc. Acts 16:33 contains an account of the baptism. They left the house when the baptism took place, and they went back into

the house when the baptism was over. Did they leave the house that the jailer' and his family might have water poured or sprinkled on them? Was it necessary? Certainly not, but it was necessary to the administration of apostolic baptism.

8. Pedobaptists urge that the baptism of the Israelites unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea is irreconcilable with the idea of immersion. In being baptized into or unto Christ we publicly assume him as our leader. The Israelites in being baptized unto Moses publicly assumed him as their leader. The resemblance of their passage through the sea, with the cloud above them, to Christian immersion no doubt suggested to Paul the language he employed. There was no literal baptism, and there was no pouring or sprinkling. How often is Psalms 77:17 referred to to prove that the Israelites had water poured on them! Unfortunately for this view of the matter, it is said, "The clouds poured out water." It was a cloud that Paul refers to the miraculous cloud, the symbol of the Divine Presence. This cloud had no more water in it than that on which the Saviour rode triumphantly to heaven. It will be observed that the Israelites were baptized in the cloud and in the sea. In literal baptism the water constitutes the envelopment. The person is baptized in water only. In the case of the Israelites it required the sea (which was as a wall on each side) and the cloud (which was above) to complete the envelopment. Who does not see that the word "baptize" is used in connection with the passage of the Israelites through the sea because it means "to immerse"? If it could be conceived that the miraculous cloud poured forth water, and that the pouring constituted the baptism, what had the sea to do in the baptismal operation? Absolutely nothing; but Paul says that "our fathers were ... baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea" (1 Corinthians 10:2).

9. It is contended that the phrase "divers washings" in Hebrews 9:10 (in the original, "baptisms") indicates more baptisms than one.

It is a significant fact that Dr. Macknight, a Presbyterian translator, renders the phrase "diverse immersions." The Mosaic law required unclean persons to "bathe themselves in water;" it required unclean vessels to be "put into water;" and it said, "All that abideth not the fire ye shall make go through the water" (Numbers 31:23). It surely will be conceded that these regulations involved "diverse immersions." There were "divers" occasions for immersing, and "divers" objects were immersed. Moreover, in the same chapter of Hebrews the verb *rantizo* ("to sprinkle") is used three times. If by "divers washings" the inspired writer included sprinklings, why did he use a different word when, as everybody knows, he intended to convey the idea of sprinkling? Is there a man under the sun who can tell?

10. Immersion, it is affirmed, is indecent and dangerous.

What says Dr. Richard Watson, in his *Theological Institutes*, a work so highly approved by his Methodist brethren? Here is his language: "With all the arrangements of modern times, baptism by immersion is not a decent practice: there is not a female, perhaps, who submits to it who has not a great previous struggle with her delicacy." Again: "Even if immersion had been the original mode of baptizing, we should in the absence of any command on the subject, direct or implied, have thought the church at liberty to accommodate the manner of applying water to the body in the name of the Trinity, in which the essence of the rite consists, to different climates and manners; but it is satisfactory to discover that all the attempts made to impose upon Christians a practice repulsive to the feelings, dangerous to the health, and offensive to delicacy is destitute of all

scriptural authority and of really primitive practice.” [Note: Vol. 2, pp. 648, 660, New York edition.]

Immersion “not a decent practice” Yet the Methodist “Discipline” authorizes it! Does it authorize an indecent practice? It recognizes immersion as valid baptism, and its validity must arise from the appointment of Jesus Christ. It cannot be valid unless he has appointed it. Will Methodists dare say that one of Christ’s appointments “is not a decent practice”? Will they say that this “practice” is “repulsive to the feelings” and “offensive to delicacy”? Can it be “repulsive to the feelings” of Christ’s friends to do what he has commanded? No “female,” it seems, “submits to” “immersion without a great previous struggle with her delicacy”! Ah, indeed! Baptists who practise immersion know nothing of this “great struggle.” The temptation to write something severe on this point is quite strong; but I resist it, and only say that persons who see “indecent” or “indelicate” in immersion are vulgar-minded. The “indecent” and the “indelicate” are in them, not in the ordinance of Christ. In the foregoing extract from Watson, where he refers to “the church” as “at liberty to accommodate the manner of applying water to the body in the name of the Trinity,” the discerning reader will detect the germ, of Popery. Ah, that “liberty to accommodate “! How mischievous has been its operation! It led Calvin to say that, though immersion was the primitive practice, “the church did grant liberty to herself, since the beginning, to change the rites somewhat, excepting the substance.” It led Watson to say that “if immersion had been the original mode of baptizing” the church would be “at liberty to accommodate the manner of applying” the water. In the last decade it led Dean Stanley to refer to the substitution of sprinkling in the place of immersion (admitted by him to have been the ancient baptism) as “the triumph of common sense and convenience over the bondage of form and custom.” Alas! the exercise of this assumed “liberty to accommodate” that is, to deviate from the order appointed by Christ resulted in the establishment of the Romish hierarchy, and has led to the formation of every Pedobaptist church under heaven. This fact is intensely suggestive.

I have now examined the most prominent objections of Pedobaptists to immersion. Whatever else may be said of these objections, it cannot be said that they have weight. They are light as the thin air lighter than vanity. They indicate the weakness of the cause they are intended to support. An examination of them must confirm Baptists in the belief of their distinctive principle which has now been considered namely, that **THE IMMERSION IN WATER OF A BELIEVER IN CHRIST IS ESSENTIAL TO BAPTISM SO ESSENTIAL THAT WITHOUT IT THERE IS NO BAPTISM.**

02.3. CHAPTER 3. BAPTISTS HOLD THAT, ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURAL ORDER, PERSONS MUST COME ...

CHAPTER 3. BAPTISTS HOLD THAT, ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURAL ORDER, PERSONS MUST COME FIRST TO CHRIST AND THEN TO THE CHURCH AND ITS ORDINANCES.

IN the foregoing pages we have seen who are subjects of baptism and what is the baptismal act. The act must not be performed until there are subjects to receive it, and the subjects must first have come to Christ. This Baptist principle is not always made so distinctly prominent as the two principles already discussed; and probably the reason is that it is supposed to be involved in them. It is, however, entitled to separate consideration, though this chapter need not be so long as either of the preceding ones.

Baptists are distinguished from all other religious denominations by their belief that no one is eligible to a church relation who has not first been brought into a personal, spiritual relation to Christ by faith in his name. In this belief we see such a divergence of views between Baptists and others as makes compromise and harmony impossible. The question is broad and deep, embracing the New Testament doctrine of a spiritual church. If Pedobaptists are right in their conception of a church, Baptists are wrong; if Baptists are right, Pedobaptists are wrong. The antagonism between them is not incidental or accidental, but essential and inevitable. It may be said it need not be said in any offensive sense that the antagonism involves a war of extermination. That is to say, if the Pedobaptist view of a church and its ordinances should be so carried into effect as to attain, universal prevalence, the Baptist view would be banished from the earth; if the Baptist view of a church and its ordinances should universally prevail, the Pedobaptist view, must become obsolete. The two views are destructive of each other. But it is time to notice the scriptural order announced at the head of this chapter.

SECTION I. The doctrine of baptismal regeneration reverses this order.

Incredible as it may appear, there are multitudes who believe in baptismal regeneration. Possibly, Roman Catholics would prefer saying that they believe in baptismal salvation. They regard baptism as essential to the salvation of infants. They are baptized that they may be introduced into the church, out of which it is believed that there is no salvation. The doctrine of Romanists is that "infants receive in baptism spiritual grace;" which, of course, means that they are made the subjects of grace and salvation. This reception of "spiritual grace" is independent of personal faith in Christ, for unconscious infants cannot exercise faith. This is virtually admitted in the provision of sponsors in the administration of baptism to infants. Godfathers and godmothers, by a sort of pious fiction, personate the infants and promise for them; or rather the infants themselves are represented, in utter disregard of truth and of fact, as promising to renounce the devil and all his works. All this is an inversion of the scriptural order, which requires a personal coming to Christ, and through him to the church and its ordinances. The Romish plan is for persons, whether infants or adults, to be brought, by means of baptismal salvation, into the church, and thus to Christ. The

Lutheran view of baptism does not differ materially from the Romish dogma. In the Augsburg Confession, drawn up by Melanchthon in 1530, and recognized as the "Creed of the German Reformers," the "grace of God" is said to be "offered through baptism." The Baptists styled "Anabaptists" are condemned because they affirm that "children are saved without baptism." The doctrine that baptism is "necessary and effectual to salvation" Dr. Hodge being judge has been "softened down" by Lutheran theologians; so that they now say that "baptism is ordinarily necessary." Dr. Krauth, in his learned volume *The Conservative Reformation and its Theology* (p. 431), expresses himself thus: "On God's part it [baptism] is not so necessary that he may not, in an extraordinary case, reach, in an extraordinary way, what baptism is his ordinary way of accomplishing. Food is ordinarily necessary to human life; so that the father who voluntarily withholds food from his child is at heart its murderer. Yet food is not so absolutely necessary to human life that God may not sustain life without it." The "softening down," according to this extract, is not very great. The position assumed is that salvation without baptism is "an extraordinary case" so much so as to be miraculous, for the illustration given teaches that God may sustain human life without food which, of course, would be nothing less than a miracle. It cannot be denied, then, that Lutherans believe that baptism is ordinarily necessary to salvation, and that salvation without it is exceptional and abnormal. It follows, according to this view, that infants are introduced into the "church" and put into a saved state without first coming to Christ. The Protestant Episcopal Church holds the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. This is evident, from what the minister, after baptizing an infant, is required to say namely, "We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into thy holy church."

It will be observed that it is taken for granted that regeneration has taken place, and that it has been effected by the Holy Spirit: "It hath pleased thee to regenerate." The same doctrine of baptismal regeneration is recognized in the Catechism, in which the child (before "confirmation") gives his or her name. Then the question is asked, "Who gave you this name?" The answer is, "My sponsors in baptism; wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." It would be difficult to conceive how baptism can do more than is here attributed to it. All the possibilities of present and eternal salvation are involved in the expressions "a member of Christ," "the child of God," and "an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." That it may be seen that I do no injustice to the teachings of the "Book of Common Prayer" I quote from a prominent Episcopal minister, Dr. Richard Newton, rector of the church of the Epiphany in Philadelphia. In a letter published in the *Life of Bishop Cummins* (p. 354) Dr. Newton says: "And after all that can be said of the different theories that may be forced on the words 'regenerate' etc., in our service for infant baptism, the natural, legitimate construction to put upon it the construction which any honest jury of twelve men with no theory to maintain on the subject would put upon it is that it does teach the horrible dogma that spiritual regeneration is inseparably connected with the use of baptism." This testimony is very strong, but its truth is equal to its strength. It furnishes cause for deep regret that millions among Romanists, Lutherans, and Episcopalians ascribe to baptism a saving efficacy, and hold what Dr. Newton terms a "horrible dogma." This "dogma" is at war with the distinctive principle of Baptists that persons must come first to Christ, and then to the church and its ordinances. The scriptural order is reversed by all the advocates of baptismal regeneration.

SECTION II. The practice of infant baptism reverses this order. The evils of infant baptism are not confined to the theory of baptismal regeneration. They develop themselves most appallingly in connection with this theory; but they are to be seen wherever and for whatever purpose infant baptism is practised. It is itself a great evil, and great evils result from it. The following language of the late godly Dr. J. Newton Brown, though strong, is not too strong: "Infant baptism is an error from beginning to end; corrupt in theory and corrupting in practice; born in superstition, cradled in fear, nursed in ignorance, supported by fraud, and spread by force; doomed to die in the light of historical investigation, and its very memory to be loathed in all future ages by a disabused church. In the realms of despotism it has shed the blood of martyrs in torrents; that blood cries against it to heaven, and a long-suffering God will yet be the terrible avenger." [Note: Essay prefixed to Memorials of Baptist Martyrs, p. 13.] In a note Dr. Brown says: "In no boastful spirit, but in the spirit of a martyr before God stung by the solemn conviction of duty after thirty-five years of earnest and impartial investigation on this subject to speak out ' the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth [Note: Essay prefixed to Memorials of Baptist Martyrs, p. 13.] we nail these THESES to the door of every Pedobaptist church in Christendom and challenge all the Christian scholarship of the age not to ignore, evade, or deny them, but to face the inevitable trial, summon the witnesses, sift the evidence, and, if it can, disprove all or any one of them. And may God help the right!"

"While Presbyterians and Methodists generally disavow all sympathy with the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, they are decided in their espousal and advocacy of infant baptism. It is strange that the spirituality of the Christian Dispensation does not lead them to give up the practice. It is pre-eminently a spiritual economy. How Jesus exalts spiritual relations above those which are natural, we clearly see in Mark 3:35 : "For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother." Paul said, "We know no man after the flesh;" but infant baptism is a recognition of the relations of the flesh. Infants, it is claimed, are proper subjects of baptism because they are descended from believing parents. This view is earnestly defended by Presbyterians, who insist that at least one of the parents of the infant to be baptized must be a believer. But the relation between parents and baptized infants is natural, whereas all the relations which the gospel recognizes are spiritual. Parents must first believe in Christ, in order to be brought into a spiritual relation with him; but their faith does not create a spiritual relation to their children. There can be no such relation until the children believe. All believers are spiritually related to one another, and the reason is that they are all in spiritual union with Christ. The relation to him is supreme, and out of it spring all subordinate spiritual relations. But Pedobaptists, in the practice of infant baptism, proceed on the supposition that the existence of a natural relation between them and their children entitles the latter to a Christian ordinance. The supposition is entirely gratuitous, and in positive conflict with the spirituality of the Christian economy. There is between parents and children no relation, whether natural or spiritual, that gives children the right to church-membership. This is plain as to the natural relation. It is equally so as to the spiritual relation, in view of the fact that it is union with Christ by faith which is a prerequisite to baptism and church membership. Hence, believing children possess this prerequisite though their parents are dead. It is their relation to Christ that decides the matter. The reference here is, of course, to children who have reached accountable years. As to unconscious infants, it is one of the strangest of strange things that they can be thought eligible to baptism and church-membership. This view is held, and can be held, by those only who reverse one of the distinctive principles of Baptists, claimed by them to be a distinctive principle of the New Testament namely, That persons must

come first to Christ, and then to the church and its ordinances. Christ's positive and gracious command is, "Come unto me." He says, "He that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." He complains of the Jews: "And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." It is manifest from these forms of expression that "coming to Christ" is a matter of supreme importance. It has an essential connection with the salvation of the soul. Coming to Christ is believing on him, and faith creates spiritual union with him: "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." The gospel permits nothing to come between Christ and sinners. Their first business is to receive him. They do this by an act of personal faith. He is a personal Saviour, and the act of faith is a personal act. There is no act more intensely personal not even the act of dying. There is no such thing as believing in Christ by proxy, but everyone must believe for himself, even as everyone must die for himself. Now, it is those only who have come to Christ by believing on him that have anything to do with the church and its ordinances. A New Testament church is a spiritual brotherhood the members of which are the subjects of spiritual life, and the ordinances of the gospel are designed for spiritual persons. The opposite view is fraught with evil, for it changes the order which Christ has established. It permits persons to come to the church and its ordinances before they come to Christ. Baptists regard this as disastrous heresy, and utter their earnest protest against it. They have stood alone in the centuries past, and they stand alone now, in advocacy of the great principle, CHRIST FIRST, THEN THE CHURCH AND ITS ORDINANCES.

02.4. CHAPTER 4. BAPTISTS BELIEVE THAT A SCRIPTURAL CHURCH IS A LOCAL CONGREGATION OF ...

CHAPTER 4. BAPTISTS BELIEVE THAT A SCRIPTURAL CHURCH IS A LOCAL CONGREGATION OF BAPTIZED BELIEVERS INDEPENDENT, UNDER CHRIST, OF THE STATE AND OF EVERY OTHER CHURCH, HAVING IN ITSELF AUTHORITY TO DO WHATEVER A CHURCH CAN OF RIGHT DO.

It requires but little reflection to see that the principle here announced is peculiar to Baptists. No other religious denomination holds it certainly not in its entirety. The important question, however, is whether the New Testament sustains this principle; for if it does not, the principle possesses no value. It will be observed that my reference is to the New Testament, for it would be absurd to go to the Old Testament to ascertain the nature of a Christian Church. In the matter of church-building, as well as in other things, Jesus said to the apostles, "Teaching them [the disciples] to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."

SECTION I. A scriptural church a local congregation of baptized believers. The Greek term *ekklesia* translated "church" more than a hundred times in the New Testament (rendered "assembly" three times) is compounded of two words literally meaning "to call out of." I shall not attempt to show how this meaning received a practical illustration when assemblies were called out among the Greeks. My present purpose is answered by the statement that in apostolic times a church was composed of persons who had been called out from the world, even as Christ chose his apostles "out of the world." They had been called from the bondage of sin into the liberty of the gospel; from spiritual darkness into the light of salvation; from the dominion of unbelief into the realm of faith from an heirship of wrath to an heirship of glory. This was true of the members of the first churches. Brought by the Holy Spirit into a new relation to God through Christ, they were prepared for church-relations and church-membership. This preparation was moral, consisting of "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." But repentance and faith are exercises of the mind, and are consequently invisible. They are private transactions between God and the soul. The world knows not of them. Churches, however, are visible organizations. This being the case, there must be some visible ceremonial qualification for membership. This qualification is baptism. There can, according to the Scriptures, be no visible church without baptism. An observance of this ordinance is the believer's first public act of obedience to Christ. Regeneration, repentance, and faith are private matters that take place in the unseen depths of the heart. They involve internal piety, but of this piety there must be an external manifestation. This manifestation is made in baptism. This is "the good profession" made by a most significant symbolic act. The penitent, regenerate believer is baptized "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." There is a visible, symbolic expression of a new relation to the three Persons of the Godhead a relation really entered into in repentance, faith, and regeneration. That baptized believers are the only persons eligible to church-membership is clear from the whole tenor of the Acts of the Apostles and of the Apostolic Epistles. Everywhere it is seen that baptism

preceded church-relations; nor is there an intimation that it was possible for an unbaptized person to be a church-member. On this point, however, there is no controversy between Baptists and Pedobaptists, for both believe in the priority of baptism to church-membership. The difference between them is on the question, What is baptism? The Baptist answer to this question has been given in the preceding part of this volume. According to that answer, baptism is the immersion in water of a believer in Jesus Christ. If, then, a church is a congregation of baptized believers, 'it is a congregation of immersed believers. An unimmersed congregation, therefore, even if a congregation of believers, is not a New Testament church. Baptists do not deny that there are pious men and women in Pedobaptist churches, so called, but they do deny that these churches are formed according to the New Testament model. They are without baptism, and, to use the words of a very distinguished Pedobaptist, Dr. E. D. Griffin, "where there is no baptism, there are no visible churches." [Note: His celebrated Letter on Communion, reviewed by Dr. Ripley, may be seen in the Boston edition of J. G. Fuller On Communion also in the American Baptist Magazine for September, 1829.] Even if Pedobaptists practised immersion, and immersion only, the introduction of the infant element into their churches would vitiate their claim to recognition as New Testament churches. The infant element must predominate over the adult element, in obedience to the law of increase in population which law renders children more numerous than parents. Surely, as Pedobaptists practise an uncommanded ceremony instead of baptism on unscriptural subjects instead of on believers their churches can lay no claim to conformity to the New Testament standard of church organization. They are not congregations of baptized believers. There can be no ecclesiastic fellowship between them and Baptists, for the latter hold most tenaciously that a scriptural church is a local congregation of baptized believers. That a church is a local congregation needs no elaborate proof. The fact is sufficiently indicated by the use of the word in both its singular and its plural form. We read of "the church at Jerusalem," "the church of God which is at Corinth," "the church of the Thessalonians," "the church of Ephesus," "the church in Smyrna," etc. Nor is it to be supposed that it required a large number of persons to constitute a church. Paul refers to Aquila and Priscilla and "the church that is in their house," to Nymphas and "the church which is in his house;" while in his letter to Philemon he says, "to the church in thy house." A congregation of saints organized according to the New Testament, whether that congregation is large or small, is a church. The inspired writers, too, use the term "churches" in the plural; and, as if forever to preclude the idea of a church commensurate with a province, a kingdom, or an empire, they say "the churches of Galatia," "the churches of Macedonia" "the churches of Asia," "the churches of Judea." In reference to an organization in a city or town or house, the singular "church" is used; but when regions of country are mentioned, we have "churches," in the plural. Wherever Christianity prevailed in apostolic times, there was a plurality of churches.

SECTION II. The Lord's Supper observed by local churches. The churches composed, as they are, of Christ's baptized disciples meet for the worship of their Lord. "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together" is the language addressed to Christians in apostolic times. Among the duties and the privileges of a congregation of baptized believers in Christ is included a commemoration of his death at his Table. Every local church is required to observe this ordinance. Its obligation to do so is inseparable from its independence; and the doctrine of church independence will be developed in future sections of this chapter. The ordinances of the gospel are placed by Christ in the custody of his churches. They dare not change them in any respect; to

change them would be disloyalty to their Lord. They have no legislative power; they are simply executive democracies required to carry into effect the will of their Head. Who but his churches can be expected to preserve the integrity and the purity of the ordinances of the Lord Jesus? These ordinances are to be kept as they were delivered to the churches and received by them. This is indispensable to the maintenance of gospel order.

What Paul writes to the Corinthians (1 Corinthians 11:20-34) clearly indicates the necessity of coming together "to eat the Lord's Supper." True, he refers to certain irregularities, which he severally condemns; but when he asks, "Despise ye the church of God?" he refers to its members, not in their individual, but in their collective, capacity the congregation of God. So, in verses 33, 34, the words "when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another," and "that ye come not together unto condemnation," show beyond doubt that the assembling of the church was requisite to the celebration of the Lord's Supper. It is a church ordinance, and therefore Baptists oppose any and every attempt to administer it privately to individuals without church sanction.

What was true of the Corinthian church as to the "coming together" of its members to commemorate the death of Christ was doubtless true of all other churches of that period. It would be absurd to suppose that there was a capricious diversity in the customs of the churches. We may therefore assume that there was uniformity. With regard to the Lord's Supper there are different views held by different religious denominations. Roman Catholics believe in what they call Transubstantiation that is, that by the consecration of the priest the bread and the wine are changed into the real body and the real blood of Christ. This doctrine defies all reasonable credence, and can be accepted only by a voracious credulity. It requires a renunciation of common sense to believe that when Jesus took bread into his hands, that bread became his body; so that he held his body in his hands! The statement of such a dogma is its sufficient exposure.

Lutherans, while they dissent from the Romish view, advocate what they call Consubstantiation. By this they mean that in the Lord's Supper the body and the blood of Christ are really present in the bread and the wine. While this view differs from the Romish, it is equally mysterious and scarcely less incredible; for it demands the impossible belief that the body of Christ is not only present in many places on earth at the same time, but that it is also in heaven. Surely the body of Christ is not omnipresent.

Episcopalians and Methodists, as well as Romanists and Lutherans, receive kneeling the bread and the wine in the Lord's Supper. The posture is an unnatural one, and the custom of kneeling no doubt has an historical connection with Transubstantiation that is to say, when the dogma was accepted as true, the bread and the wine were considered suitable objects of adoration. Hence the kneeling attitude was assumed by Romanists, transmitted by them to Episcopalians, and from them inherited by Methodists. It is strange, in view of the idolatrous origin of the custom of kneeling, that it is continued by those who abjure idolatry. This by the way.

There is one thing in the service of Episcopalians and Methodists which must ever impress Baptists as very strange: The minister, in delivering the bread to each person, says, "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." In giving the cup he says, "The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." [Note: The Methodist "Discipline" transposes the terms "body" and "soul".] This may not be, but it seems to be, a prayer offered to the body and the blood

of Christ, which are invoked to preserve unto everlasting life the body and the soul of the person addressed. Prayer to Christ is eminently proper, for it is justified by the example of the dying Stephen; but prayer to the body and the blood of Christ is utterly indefensible.

Presbyterians are nearer right in their views of the Lord's Supper than are the denominations to which I have referred. They do not kneel and they make prominent the commemorative feature of the ordinance. True, they call it a "sealing ordinance;" and these words Baptists vainly try to understand. What is sealed? "The covenant of grace," they say. How is this? They say also that "baptism seals" it. Has it two seals? Among men covenants are invalid without seals. Is the covenant of grace invalid for purposes of salvation unless the seals of baptism and the Lord's Supper are appended to it? Presbyterians will hardly answer in the affirmative. The truth is the New Testament never refers to baptism and the Lord's Supper as "sealing ordinances," and for the best reason: It teaches that believers are "sealed by the Holy Spirit unto the day of redemption." If the Holy Spirit seals, there is security; and there is something wrong in the theology which makes baptism and the Lord's Supper "sealing ordinances."

Baptists hold that, as the Lord's Supper is a church ordinance, the supreme prerequisite to it is church-membership. Baptism, it is true, is often referred to as a prerequisite, and so it is, but only in the sense that it is a prerequisite to church-membership. The members of every local church can claim it as a right to come to the Lord's Table" in that church, but in no other. They may, through fraternal courtesy, be admitted to the Lord's Supper in sister-churches, but to demand admittance as a right would be an assault on church independence. This is a matter so plain that it is needless to dwell on it. It sometimes creates a smile when it is said that Baptists are more liberal in their views and practice in regard to the Lord's Supper than are any other people; but it is true. It is true in the sense that they believe that all whom they baptize and receive into church-membership are entitled to seats at the Lord's Table; and it is true in the sense that they welcome to that Table all whom they baptize. They dare not sever from each other the two ordinances of the gospel. Of what other denomination can this be said? I refer to the denominations of Protestant Christendom. Among Episcopalians, Lutherans, Presbyterians, and Methodists baptism and the Lord's Supper are put asunder that is to say, this is true of "baptized children" as distinguished from "communicants." With Episcopalians and Lutherans these "baptized children," so called, are kept from the Lord's Table until they receive the rite of "Confirmation." It is not possible to give a good reason for this practice; for if through "sponsors" they are entitled to baptism, they are also entitled to the Lord's Supper. Presbyterians require in the "baptized children" evidence of personal piety before they are allowed to come to the Lord's Table, and Methodists, to say the least, insist that there shall be "a desire to flee from the wrath to come." The argument against inviting infants is that infants cannot "discern the body and blood of the Lord Jesus." This is doubtless true; but it is equally true that they cannot discern the spiritual significance of baptism. If the inability to "discern" is a bar to the Lord's Table, it should also be a bar to the Lord's baptism. There can be no good reason for severing the ordinances of the gospel. Those who are entitled to baptism are entitled to the Lord's Supper. There is an interference with scriptural order whenever the two ordinances are disjoined. The interference cannot be justified. Baptists, therefore, say that the Lord's Supper is not scripturally observed among Pedobaptists. They have neither scriptural baptism nor scriptural church-membership, and there cannot be a scriptural administration of the Lord's Supper. In addition to this, they withhold from a large number

perhaps a majority of those who, in their judgment, are baptized the Lord's Supper. This is a great inconsistency. It must be said, however, that if the ordinances were not sundered that is, if all baptized by Pedobaptists were permitted to come to the Lord's Supper the service would be vitiated by the presence of a majority composed of unbelievers and of those incapable of believing. In view of such considerations as these, it will readily be seen why Baptists believe that Pedobaptists fail to observe the Lord's Supper according to the New Testament, even as they fail to administer New Testament baptism. On the other hand, it is a distinctive Baptist principle that a scriptural church is a congregation of baptized believers in Christ, whose duty and privilege it is "to eat the Lord's Supper." All the members of such a church are required to commemorate their Lord's death. They are united to him by faith in his name, and through him, by spiritual ties, to one another, while their baptism has incorporated them into one body, and their partaking of "one bread" (1 Corinthians 10:17) is a symbol of their unity.

Baptists detach from the Lord's Supper every idea of Transubstantiation, Consubstantiation, ritual efficacy, sealing virtue, etc., and consider it a memorial of Christ's death. Its commemorative office is that which constitutes its supreme distinction. Everything else connected with it is secondary and incidental. "This do in remembrance of me," said Jesus in instituting the ordinance on the night of the betrayal. In the eating of the broken bread he requires that his crucified body be remembered; in the drinking of the cup he enjoins a remembrance of his blood. That the faculty of memory is specially exercised concerning the death of Christ in the sacred Supper is manifest from 1 Corinthians 11:26 : "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." We do not show his birth or baptism or burial or resurrection or ascension, but his death. If ever the tragedy of Calvary should engross the thoughts of the Christian to the exclusion of every other subject, it is when he sits at the Table of the Lord. Then memory must reproduce the scenes of the crucifixion and so hold them up to the mind that Christ is "evidently set forth crucified." Then in the eating of the bread and the drinking of the cup the body and the blood of the Lord are "spiritually discerned," and the ordinance, by the presence of the Holy Spirit, becomes a rich blessing to the soul. It becomes the means of strengthening faith in Christ and of increasing love to him; while memory goes back to his death, and hope looks to his second coming, when his personal presence will supersede the necessity of any symbol to promote a remembrance of him.

SECTION III.

Definition of church independence.

There are three prominent forms of church-government, indicated by the terms Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, and Independency.

Episcopacy recognizes the right of bishops to preside over districts of country, and one of its fundamental doctrines is that a bishop is officially superior to an elder. Of course, in that church, a modern bishop has under his charge the "inferior clergy" as well as "the laity" for it is insisted that the "ordaining power" and the "right to rule" belong to the episcopal office. The apostolic times "bishop" and "pastor" were terms of equivalent import. The elders of the church of Ephesus are styled (Acts 20:28) "overseers" in the original, episeopoi, the word generally translated "bishop," if, indeed, "bishop" may be called a translation. It is so evident from the Scriptures that bishops and elders are identical that it is the greatest folly to call it in question. This, however, is not the place to

enlarge on the topic.

Presbyterianism recognizes two classes of elders preaching elders and ruling elders. The pastor and the ruling elders of a congregation constitute what is called the "Session of the church." The "Session" transacts the business of the church, receives, dismisses, and excludes members. From the decision of a Session there is an appeal to Presbytery, which is composed of preaching and ruling elders. From the action of a Presbytery there lies an appeal to Synod, and from the adjudications of Synod there is an appeal to the General Assembly, whose decrees are final and irresistible. These Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies are often termed "church courts," "judicatories of the church." The friends of Presbyterianism, no doubt, deem their form of government most expedient and satisfactory j but to prove it scriptural must be as difficult as to show that baptism has been substituted for circumcision. Where is it intimated in the Scriptures that there is an appeal from the lower to the higher "church courts"? While Presbyterians, therefore, talk and write about the expediency of their form of government, they ought to say nothing of its scripturalness. It is unquestionably a better government than the Episcopal, but it is not the government established by Jesus Christ. It is easily seen that Episcopacy and Presbyterianism imply that many local congregations enter representatively into the composition of what is called "the church." We, therefore, often hear of the "Episcopal Church of the United States of America," the "Presbyterian Church of the United States." The local religious communities in all parts of the nation where Episcopacy prevails are considered as constituting the "Episcopal Church." So of Presbyterianism and Methodism. The Baptist Church of the United States is a form of expression which ought never to be used which can never be used with propriety. There are more than twenty thousand Baptist churches in the United States, but they do not constitute one great Baptist Church of the United States. They differ materially and fundamentally from Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Methodist churches. They are all independent of the state.

This, however, is true of all religious denominations in this country; for the genius of our republic does not tolerate "Union between Church and State." But it deserves special notice that Baptists, with their views of the spirituality of New Testament churches, could not, under any form of government, enter into an alliance with the state. Episcopacy is established by law in England, Presbyterianism in Scotland, Lutheranism in Germany and Sweden and Denmark. When Jesus stood before Pilate, he said, "My kingdom is not of this world." The view which Baptists have of these words is entirely hostile to the doctrine of a state church. Their appreciation of "soul-liberty" is so great that they can allow no interference with it. They are the friends of civil government, and believe any form of government better than anarchy. They pray for civil rulers, whether they be presidents or kings, but deny the right of the civil power to intrude into the spiritual realm of conscience. Their blood, often shed by their persecutors, has often testified to the sincerity of their belief. Their views find expression in the stanza:

"Let Caesar's dues be ever paid
To Caesar and his throne;
But consciences and souls were made
For God, the Lord, alone."

Churches formed according to the New Testament model are not only independent of the state, but in matters pertaining to government they are independent of one another. They are interdependent only in the sense involved in mutual fellowship; and their mutual influence is not to be lightly esteemed, for it answers valuable purposes. But it must not be forgotten that every local congregation of baptized believers united in church worship and work is as complete a church as ever existed, and is perfectly competent to do whatever a church can of right do. It is as complete as if it were the only church in the world.

It follows from the doctrine of church independence that no church is at liberty to interfere with the internal affairs of another. Every Baptist church is an independent and a pure democracy. The idea of independence should be earnestly cherished, while that of consolidation should be as earnestly deprecated. Agreeably to the view now presented, we read in the New Testament of “the churches of Judea,” “the churches of Galatia,” “the churches of Macedonia,” but we never read of the church of Judea and of other provinces. There is not the remotest reference to a church commensurate with a province, with a kingdom, or with an empire. This view of church extension and consolidation was post-apostolic manifestly so.

There are no people who recognize more fully than do Baptists the fact that the phrase “kingdom of Christ” implies that he is King, Monarch, Autocrat. In ordaining the laws of his kingdom he did not allow the impertinent interference of men. There is no human legislation in the kingdom of Christ. Churches organized according to the New Testament are required to execute the laws of Christ. To do this they must first decide what those laws are. It may be said, therefore, that the churches of Christ are invested with judicial and executive power, but they have no legislative power. Ecclesiastical legislation such as is permitted in many Pedobaptist organizations is abhorrent to the spirit of the gospel. Churches are executive democracies organized to carry out the sovereign will of their Lord and King. The Baptist view of this matter is forcibly expressed in the language of the late J. M. Peck, D. D. Referring to Baptists, he says:

“Their theory of church government embraces two great and apparently opposite principles.

“First. That the kingdom of Christ, in its visible form on earth, is a pure monarchy. Christ is King and Lawgiver. He needs not the aid of man, nor will he endure human legislation in any form. He has not merely given a few vague and general rules, and left his people to work out all the discordant plans of government that prevail at this moment in Christendom. Both by precept and in the inspired records of the primitive churches there are examples for every class of cases that necessity ever requires. The legislation in his kingdom is all divine.

“Secondly. His kingdom, in its organized state of small communities, each managing its own affairs in its own vicinage, is a pure democracy. THE PEOPLE THE WHOLE PEOPLE in each community choose their own officers, receive and expel members, conduct all business as a body politic, decide on all questions of discipline, -and observe all the institutions of Christ. Were they to institute a representative or any other form of government, they would depart from the law-book and soon be involved in as many difficulties as their neighbors.” [Note: Christian Repository (1853), vol. 2, pp. 47, 48.] In accordance with these principles, the governmental power of churches is, under Christ, with the members, including pastors and deacons. These officers, however, can do nothing without the concurrence of the membership. It results of necessity from church independence that a majority must rule, that the power of a church cannot be transferred or

alienated, and that church action is final. The power of a church cannot be delegated. There may be messengers of a church, but not delegates. No church can empower any man or anybody of men to do anything which will impair its independency.

These are highly-important principles; and, while the existence of the independent form of church government depends on their recognition and application, it is an inquiry of vital moment, Does the New Testament recognize these principles? For if it does not, whatever may be said in commendation of them they possess no binding force. I refer to the New Testament, because it would be unjustifiable to go to the Old to ascertain the form of government established for Christian churches. Jesus Christ, in instructing the apostles how to train the baptized disciples, says, "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matthew 28:20). He does not say "all things that Moses commanded," but "all things whatsoever I have commanded." The apostles enjoyed his teaching during his ministry, and the "forty days" between his resurrection and his ascension he employed in speaking to them of "the things pertaining to the kingdom of God" (Acts 1:3). It may be said that Paul was not with Christ during his ministry, and that he did not enjoy the advantage of the "forty days" instruction. This is true; but his deficiencies, as compared with those of the other apostles, were evidently supplied by direct revelations from heaven. It will be seen, therefore, that the apostles themselves had no discretionary power. They were to teach the observance of all things their Lord and Master had "commanded" no more, no less. Whatever they taught under the influence of inspiration must have accorded with the teachings of Christ. Whatever they did as inspired men may be considered as done by him.

SECTION IV. The churches of the New Testament received, excluded, and restored members. In proof and in illustration of this proposition the following facts are submitted. In Romans 14:1 it is written: "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations." What is the meaning of the first clause of this verse? Its import is obviously this: Receive into your fellowship, and treat as a Christian, the man who is weak in faith. The paraphrase of Mr. Barnes is, "Admit to your society or fellowship, receive him kindly." There is unquestionably a command: "RECEIVE YE." To whom is this command addressed? To bishops? It is not. To the "Session of the church," composed of the pastor and the "ruling elders"? No. To whom, then? To the very persons to whom the Epistle was addressed; and it was written "to all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints" (Romans 1:7). No ingenuity can torture this language into a command given to the officers of the church in Rome. The members of the church whose designation was "saints" were addressed, and they were commanded to "receive the weak in faith" It was their business to decide who should be admitted into their brotherhood and Paul, under the impulses of inspiration, says, "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye." It was, of course, their duty to withhold their fellowship from those who had no faith. The right of the apostolic churches to withdraw their fellowship from unworthy members (2 Thessalonians 3:6) plainly implies their right to receive persons of proper qualifications into their fellowship. It is inconceivable that they had the authority to exclude, but not to receive, members.

I now proceed to show that the New Testament churches exercised the right of excluding unworthy members. In 1 Corinthians 5:1-5 we read as follows: "It is reported commonly that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles, that one should have his father's wife. And ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you. For I verily, as absent in body, but

present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.”

It is quite worthy of remark that, while Paul “judged” that the incestuous member ought to be excluded from the church, he did not exclude him. He had no right to do so, and did not claim the right. The same apostle said to the “churches of Galatia,” “I would they were even cut off which trouble you” (Galatians 5:12); but he did not cut them off, though he desired it to be done and advised that it should be done.

It is worthy of notice too that the members of the Corinthian church could not, in their individual capacity, exclude the incestuous man. It was necessary to their action in the premises that they should be “gathered together.” They must assemble as a church and exemplify the doctrine of a pure democracy. Thus assembling, “the power of our Lord Jesus Christ” was to be with them. They were to act by his authority and to execute his will; for he makes it incumbent on his churches to administer discipline. In the last verse of the chapter referred to, Paul says: “Put away from among yourselves that wicked person.” Here is a command, given by an inspired man, requiring the exclusion of an unworthy member of the church at Corinth. To whom was the command addressed? To the official members of the church?

No, but “unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints.” The right of a church to exclude disorderly persons from its fellowship is recognized in these words: “Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly” (2 Thessalonians 3:6). This command was addressed “to the church of the Thessalonians.” To “withdraw” from a “disorderly brother” is the same thing as to exclude him. There is a cessation of church-fellowship.

I have not referred to Matthew 18:17, because I shall notice it in another place. The reader will see on examination that the passage clearly shows the power of “the church” to perform the act of excommunication by which the member cut off becomes “as a heathen man and a publican.”

It is not more evident that New Testament churches received and excluded members than that they restored excluded members who gave satisfactory evidence of penitence. In 2 Corinthians 2:6-8 the “incestuous man” is again referred to, as follows: “Sufficient to such a man is this punishment, which was inflicted of many. So that contrariwise ye ought rather to forgive him, and comfort him, lest perhaps such a one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow. Wherefore I beseech you that ye would confirm your love toward him.”

Paul manages this case with the greatest delicacy and tenderness. He refers to the excluded member without the least allusion to the disgraceful offence for which he was excluded. “Sufficient,” says he, “is this punishment” that is, the object of the exclusion had been accomplished. The church had shown its determination not to connive at sin, and the excluded member had become penitent. But the point under consideration is that the apostle advised the restoration of the penitent offender. Paul could no more restore him to the church than he could exclude him from it; but he says, “I beseech you that ye would confirm your love toward him.” The power and the right to restore were with the church, and Paul solicits an exercise of the power and

of the right. The great apostle, in saying "I beseech you," bows to the majesty of the doctrine of church independence. He virtually admits that nothing could be done unless the church chose to act. In this connection one fact should be carefully observed: The power of the Corinthian church to restore this excluded member is unquestionable. The fact which deserves special notice and emphasis is that the power, in apostolic churches, to restore excluded members implies the power of receiving members, and also of expelling the unworthy. Without a first reception there could be no exclusion, and without exclusion there could be no subsequent restoration. Thus the act of restoration irresistibly implies the two previous acts of reception and exclusion. Now, if the New Testament churches had the power and the right to do these three things, they must have had the power and the right to transact any other business coming before them. Nothing can be of more vital importance to the welfare, and even to the existence, of a church than the reception, the exclusion, and the restoration of members. There are no three acts whose influence on the organic structure and prosperity of a church is so great; and these acts the churches of the New Testament undoubtedly performed.

Here I might let the foundation principle of church independency rest; but there is other proof of the New Testament recognition of that principle.

SECTION V. The churches of the New Testament appointed their officers. In Acts 1:1-26 there is an account of the election of Matthias to the apostleship. He was to succeed Judas the traitor. The most natural inference is that Matthias was chosen by the "one hundred and twenty disciples" mentioned in Acts 1:15. These "disciples" were, no doubt, the church to which the three thousand converts were added on the day of Pentecost. The brethren must have been held in high estimation by Peter if called on, in conjunction with the apostles themselves, to elect a successor to Judas. In Acts 6:1-15 : there is reference to the circumstances which originated the office of deacon, and also to the manner in which the first deacons were appointed. We read as follows: "And in those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration. Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables. "Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word. And the saying pleased the whole multitude: and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas, a proselyte of Antioch; whom they set before the apostles: and when they had prayed they laid their hands on them."

It will be seen from this narrative that the apostles referred the matter of grievance to "the multitude of the disciples;" directed the "brethren to look out seven men;" that "the saying pleased the whole multitude;" that "they chose Stephen" and the others. The democracy of the whole arrangement is as clear as the light of day. The people, the whole membership of the church at Jerusalem, were recognized as the responsible source of authority, and they were required to make selection of suitable men. Large as was the number of church-members, they did not, for the sake of convenience, or for any other reason, delegate to a representative few the power to act for them. They knew nothing of a delegation of power. The whole multitude acted. In Acts 14:23 there is mention made of the ordination of elders in every church, as follows: "And when they had

ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord on whom they believed.” Some think that William Tyndale’s translation comes nearer to the meaning of the original. With the spelling modernized, it is as follows: “And when they had ordained them seniors by election, in every congregation, after they had prayed and fasted, they commended them to God, on whom they believed.” The word in the original here translated “ordained” literally means “to stretch forth the hand,” as is the custom in Baptist churches when a vote is taken. Tyndale puts in the words “by election,” believing, as he did, that the New Testament churches elected their elders by the votes of the members. He also states in his Rights of the Church as quoted by Lyman Coleraan in his Apostolical and Primitive Church (p. 63) that the Greek word referred to (cheirotoneo, from cheir, “the hand,” and teino, “to stretch forth”) is interpreted as he interprets it “by Erasmus, Beza, Diodati, and those who translated the Swiss, French, Italian, Belgic, and even English, Bibles, till the Episcopal correction, which leaves out the words, f by election,’ as well as the marginal notes, which affirm that the apostles did not thrust pastors into the church through a lordly superiority, but chose and placed them there by the voice of the congregation.”

Every one can imagine why the “Episcopal correction” was made. The words “by election” would give the “laity” an agency and an influence which the “Episcopal clergy” would not willingly allow. The word cheirotoneo is used but twice in the New Testament in the passage under consideration and in 2 Corinthians 8:19. In the latter it is translated “chosen,” and the choice was “by the churches.” In the former it certainly means that elders were chosen, appointed, not without, but by means of, the suffrages of the churches. Mr. Barnes, in his notes on the passage, well remarks: “It is said, indeed, that Paul and Barnabas did this. But probably all that is meant by it is that they presided in the assembly when the choice was made. It does not mean that they appointed them without consulting the church; but it evidently means that they appointed them in the usual way of appointing officers by the suffrages of the people.” In view of the facts now presented, it is plain that according to the New Testament the officers of a church are chosen by the church. No one church has the right to choose officers for another. No combination of churches has the right. Every church is as independent in its action as if it were the only church in the world. It will not be forgotten that “elders were ordained in every church.” There was, of course, uniformity of custom: all the churches of apostolic times were formed after the same model. That there was diversity in their formation is utterly incredible. In further support of the principle of Independency, I state the following facts without elaborating them: In the Jerusalem Council of which we are informed in Acts 15, “the whole church,” the “brethren,” are named in connection with the “apostles and elders:” “Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole church, to send chosen men;” “And they wrote letters by them after this manner: The apostles and elders and brethren send greeting.” The members of the church at Jerusalem acted, as well as the apostles and the elders. The churches of apostolic times sent forth ministers on missionary-tours. When Antioch received the word of God, the church at Jerusalem “sent forth Barnabas, that he should go as far as Antioch” (Acts 11:22). His labors were successful “much people was added to the Lord” and at a subsequent period the church in Antioch sent out Saul and Barnabas, who made a long journey, performed much labor, returned, and reported to the church “all that God had done with them.” They “gathered the church together” before they gave an account of their labors. [Note: See Acts 13:1-3; Acts 14:26-27.] With what deferential respect did these ministers treat the church that sent them forth! Their example is worthy of imitation by ministers of all generations. The apostles, so far

from exercising lordship over the churches, did not control their charities. This is seen in Acts 5:4; Acts 11:29-30; 1 Corinthians 16:1-2; 2 Corinthians 9:7. The churches, too, selected messengers to convey their charities. [Note: See 1 Corinthians 16:3; 2 Corinthians 8:18-19; Php 2:25; Php 4:18.] Surely, if they chose those whom they put in charge of their pecuniary contributions, they appointed those to whom they committed their spiritual interests. In view of all the considerations now presented, the position held by Baptists namely, that the New Testament churches appointed their officers is established beyond successful denial. I term this the position of Baptists; for they alone hold it in the fulness of its significance. Certainly no other religious denomination in this country so holds it. There is among Episcopalians, Lutherans, Presbyterians, and Methodists no local church that has exclusive authority to appoint its minister or pastor. No rector is placed over an Episcopal congregation without the action of a bishop. With Lutherans, what is called the "Ministerium," which is "composed of ministers only," has the right of "licensing and ordaining ministers." Among Presbyterians, whatever a local church may do, the action of Presbytery is necessary in licensing and ordaining men to preach. With Methodists, pastors are settled over local churches by the appointment of bishops. Even the office of "local preacher" cannot be conferred by a local congregation. The action of a "Quarterly Conference" is necessary in granting license to preach. Of these four large denominations it has to be said that their regulations with regard to the appointment of ministers are in conflict with the New Testament principle of church independence. This principle is violated when a local church is denied the right of appointing its own officers. Congregationalists are generally supposed to agree with Baptists as to the appointment of ministers; but they do not. Their theory may be correct; but if so, their practice is a departure from it. They have what they call "Consociations" and "Associations" the former chiefly in Connecticut. With regard to these, Dr. Dexter admits that there are in them "Presbyterian tendencies;" while of Associations he says: "As a matter of convenience, advantage has been taken of these regular assemblages of the pastors, by candidates for the pulpit, to present themselves, after thorough training, for examination for a certificate of approval in common parlance, 'for licensure.'" [Note: Dexter On Congregationalism, p. 225, edition of 1865.]

It is easy to see that Dr. Dexter does not approve this method of "licensure;" but it is difficult to see how he can help it. The practice seems to be established, [Note: To show the correctness of this view, I may state that Adoniram Judson was "licensed to preach" in the year 1810 by an "Association of Congregationalist Ministers." (See Wayland's of Judson, Vol. 1, p. 51.)] In proof of this, I may quote from what The Congregationalist of April 13, 1881, says of the meeting of the Manhattan Association: "The principal business was the examination of four seniors of Union Seminary, who passed creditably and were licensed to preach." Among the examiners were Drs. Wm. M. Taylor, R. S. Storrs, and Ray Palmer—quite renowned names. These distinguished men have thus given their sanction to the plan of licensing ministers, not by churches, but by Associations. Baptists stand alone in insisting that the right to license and ordain ministers is a right, under Christ, resident in a local church. It exists nowhere else. If exercised by bishops, Ministeriums, Consociations, or Associations, there is usurpation; and, of course, there is a violation of the order of the New Testament. Baptists believe that God calls men to preach the gospel, and that the churches recognize his call. They cannot make a minister, but they can approve what God has done at least, what they believe he has done. This is all a church does in voting for the ordination of one of its members to the pastoral office. Believing him to be divinely called to the office, the church, by its vote, recognizes the call; and this vote of recognition is the

essence of ordination. Such, a vote must precede a Council of ordination, and the Council is called by the church of which the brother is a member. Andrew Fuller well remarks: "The only end for which I join in an ordination is to unite with the elders of that and other churches in expressing my brotherly concurrence in the election, which, if it fell on what I accounted an unsound or unworthy character, I should withhold. Though churches are so far independent of each other as that no one has a right to interfere in the concerns of another without their consent, unless it be as we all have a right to exhort and admonish one another, yet there is a common union required to subsist between them for the good of the whole; and, so far as the ordination of a pastor affects this common or general interest, it is fit that there should be a general concurrence in it. It was on this principle, I conceive, rather than as an exercise of authority, that the apostles, whose office was general, took the lead in the primitive ordinations. When the churches increased they appointed such men as Timothy and Titus to do what they would have done themselves had they been present; and when all extraordinary officers ceased, the same general object would be answered by the concurrence of the elders of the surrounding churches." [Note: Works of Andrew Fuller, vol. 3, p. 494.] No action of an ordaining Council can in any way impair the integrity or independence of the church which calls such Council. When a Council recognizes and approves what a church has done, its moral influence, though it can impart no grace, is promotive of the usefulness of the pastor ordained and of the church over which he presides. If, however, a Council should withhold its recognition and approval, and if by its advice, the church should revoke its former action, there would be nothing in all this conflicting in the least with the doctrine of church independence.

SECTION VI.

Church action is final. The independence of a church implies the right of a majority of its members to rule in accordance with the laws of Christ. In 2 Corinthians 2:6 it is written: "Sufficient to such a man is this punishment, which was inflicted of many." A literal translation of the words rendered "of many" would be "by the more" that is, by the majority. The rendering of Macknight, and also of Davidson in his Revision, is "by the greater number." If, as has been shown, the governmental power of a church is with the members, it follows that a majority must rule that is to say, either the majority or the minority must govern. But it is absurd to refer to the rule of the minority. That a majority must rule is so plain a principle of Independency, and so plain a principle of common sense, that it is needless to dwell upon it.

It has been stated on a preceding page that the power of a church cannot be transferred or alienated. From this fact results the finality of church action. The church at Corinth could not transfer her authority to the church at Philippi, nor could the church at Antioch convey her power to the church at Ephesus; nor could all the apostolic churches delegate their power to an Association, a Synod, a Conference, or a Convention. The power of a church is manifestly inalienable, and, this being true, church action is final. That there is no tribunal higher than that of a church is evident from Matthew 18:15-17 : "Moreover, if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: If he shall hear thee thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican."

Here the Saviour lays down a rule for the settlement of grievances among brethren. If the offender, when told of his fault, does not give satisfaction, the offended party is to take with him "one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established." But if the offender "shall neglect to hear them," what is to be done? "Tell it to the church." What church? The aggregate body of the redeemed? This is equally impossible and absurd. I ask again, What church? Evidently the local congregation to which the parties belong. If the offender does not hear the church, what then and finally? "Let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican" that is, let the offender no longer be held in church-fellowship, but let him occupy the place of "a heathen man and a publican." There is to be an end to Christian fellowship and association. This idea cannot be more fully emphasized than by the reference to "a heathen man [a Gentile] and a publican," the most unworthy character, in Jewish estimation, to be found among Gentiles. But can there be no appeal from the action of a single local church to an "Association" or a "Presbytery" or a "Conference"? No; there is no appeal. Shall an Association or a Presbytery or a Conference put the offender back in church-fellowship, when the church by its action classed him with heathens and publicans? This is too preposterous. What kind of fellowship would it be, when the church had declared the excluded member unworthy of its fellowship? Will it be asked, What is to be done if the action of a church does not give satisfaction to all concerned? I answer, Do what is done when the action of a Presbyterian General Assembly or a Methodist General Conference or an Episcopal General Convention does not give satisfaction. Do nothing. There must be a stopping-place; there must be final action. Baptists say, with the New Testament before them, that the action of each local congregation of baptized believers is final. [Note: The above reasoning takes it for granted that the excluded member is justly excluded. If so, he must give evidence of penitence, in order to his restoration. If unjustly excluded, and the church does not, when the injustice is shown, annul its action, the excluded member may apply for admission into a sister-church, which may, in the exercise of its independence, receive him without encroaching on the independence of the excluding church. The opposite view would imply that the excluding church has a monopoly of independence, which is absurd.] Let those who oppose the Baptist form of church government show anywhere in the Scriptures the remotest allusion to an appeal from the decision of a church to any other tribunal. It cannot be done. There were, in apostolic times, no tribunals analogous to modern Synods, Conferences, Conventions. Let those who affirm that there were such "courts of appeal" adduce the evidence. On them rests the burden of proof. Baptists deny that there is such proof, and say that for any man to furnish it is as difficult as for "a camel to go through the eye of a needle." The view which I have presented of the independence of the first churches is in such full historical accord with the facts in the case that many distinguished Pedobaptists have been obliged to concede it. They have done this while giving their practical sanction to other forms of church government. Hence Mosheim, a Lutheran and a bitter opponent of Baptists, in referring to the first century, says: "The churches, in those early times, were entirely independent, none of them being subject to any foreign jurisdiction, but each governed by its own rulers and its own laws; for, though the churches founded by the apostles had this particular deference shown to them, that they were consulted in difficult and doubtful cases, yet they had no juridical authority, no sort of supremacy over the others, nor the least right to enact laws for them." [Note: Maclaine's Mosheim, Baltimore edition, vol. 1, p. 39.]

Archbishop Whately, a dignitary of the Church of "England, referring to the New Testament churches, says: "They were each a distinct, independent community on earth, united by the

common principles on which they were founded, and by their mutual agreement, affection, and respect, but not having any one recognized head on earth, or acknowledging any sovereignty of one of these societies over others.” Again: “A CHURCH and a DIOCESE seem to have been for a considerable time coextensive and identical. And each church or diocese (and consequently each superintendent), though connected with the rest by ties of faith and hope and charity, seems to have been (as has been already observed) perfectly independent, as far as regards any power of control.” [Note: Kingdom of Christ, Carter’s edition, pp. 36, 44. 18] This is strong testimony from a Lutheran and an Episcopalian. They would have given a different account of the matter if they could have done so consistently with truth. They virtually condemned their denominational organizations in writing what I have quoted. I might refer to Neander, and to many other Pedobaptists of distinction who have expressed themselves in substance as Mosheim and Whately have done; but it is needless. Baptists are not dependent on the testimony of church historians. They make their appeal to the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. If all the church histories in the world said the monarchical or aristocratic form of church, government was maintained from the death of the apostle John onward, they would not be moved by it while the New Testament represents every church as a democracy fully competent to transact its own business. “To the law and to the testimony;” “All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works” (Isaiah 8:20; 2 Timothy 3:16-17).

Baptists have ever regarded every church as complete in itself, independent, so far as its government is concerned, of every other church under heaven. They have watched with jealous eye all encroachments on church independence. For their views on baptism its subjects and its act a regenerated church-membership, and the independent form of church government, they have been persecuted, tortured, put to death. Their blood has flowed like water. From their ranks have been taken martyrs who, having endured “much tribulation,” are now before the throne of God. But the principles of Baptists still live, and will live; for they are indestructible divinely vital cannot die.

SECTION VII.

Superior advantages of Independency.

If the form of church government advocated in this chapter is in accordance with the New Testament, it follows that it has advantages superior to those of all other forms of government. Some of these advantages will now be pointed out. Of church independence it may be said:

1. It is best suited to every form of civil government. In monarchies, whether absolute or limited, there is no reason why the churches of Jesus Christ should not be independent. Monarchies have to do with men as civil subjects, but not in their relations to God. The power of the monarch is a secular power, and cannot be rightfully exercised outside of the realm of secular jurisdiction; while Christianity belongs to the spiritual realm and confines itself to it. But even when monarchy transcends its proper limits and interferes with spiritual concerns, there is no reason why the independent form of church government should be exchanged for any other. In proof of this I need only refer to the fact that the apostolic churches were independent while the tyrant Nero reigned at Rome and caused the weight of his sceptre to be felt in all the provinces of his empire. The churches even then, wherever permitted to meet for worship, transacted whatever business claimed their attention.

“What has been said of monarchies may, of course, be said with greater emphasis of aristocratic forms of civil government. Under the legitimate operation of such governments there is no encroachment on the rights of churches, and the doctrine of church independence can be exemplified without collision with the civil authority.

What is true of monarchies and aristocracies may be said with supreme emphasis of republics; for the latter recognize the people as the source of governmental power. This recognition accords with the philosophy of independent church government. If in monarchies, where the people are supposed to exist for the purpose of carrying into effect the monarch’s will; if in aristocracies, where the people are reduced, comparatively, to ciphers churches can flourish in their independence, much more is this independence cherished under the auspices of republican government. Truly, then, may it be said that church independence is best suited to every form of civil government.

2. It is in accord with the tendencies of the age. The most superficial observer of men and things is aware that the democratic element has occasionally, at least indicated its existence in Europe for some centuries, while in recent years it has increased in strength. The colloquial remark has been attributed to Thomas Jefferson whether truly or not I cannot say that “the former European doctrine was that the great mass of men were born with saddles on their backs, while a few were born with boots and spurs on, and that the purpose of Divine Providence was for those with the boots and spurs to ride those having the saddles on them.”

If this absurd doctrine has not been exploded, it is certainly in a process of explosion. Oppressed humanity, under the burdens imposed by monarchy and aristocracy, is everywhere restless and waiting for a suitable opportunity to assert its rights. The tendencies of the age are in favor of bringing the democratic element out of obscurity and exalting it to prominence. It is fast becoming an axiom that the people are the source of power, and that sovereignty inheres in them not in kings and aristocracies, but in the people. How much the practical workings of church independence have had to do in developing the doctrine of popular rights it is impossible to say, but there is every reason to believe that they have promoted the development. Hence it may be said without hesitation that church independence is in accord with the tendencies of the age.

3. It gives suitable prominence to the membership of a church. This is seen in the fact that without the agency of a church nothing can be done. Pastor and deacons are powerless if a church declines to act. Their official business is to do that for which they are elected by the suffrages of the church of which they are members. They are responsible, under Christ, to the church from which they receive not only official authority, but official existence. In the forms of government preferred by Episcopalians, Lutherans, Presbyterians, and Methodists there is only an indirect recognition of the body of the members as the source of power. The recognition is more decided among Presbyterians than among the rest, but it is not complete. The constitution of their “highest court,” the General Assembly, is proof of this. The tribunal of last appeal is composed of ministers and ruling elders in equal numbers. This equality indicates a very partial concession of rights to the members. Everyone can see this who will take the trouble to learn how much greater is the number of members than of ministers. With regard to Episcopalians, it will be seen how powerless the members are, even in connection with the “inferior clergy,” when it is stated that in their General Conventions nothing can be done without the concurrence of the “House of Bishops.”

That the people are comparatively ignored by Lutheranism appears in the fact that a "Ministerium," that "licenses ministers," is composed entirely of ministers, and that the Synod, the highest tribunal, from which there is no appeal, is formed by an equal number of "clerical and lay delegates." Among Methodists the "lay element" is conspicuous by its absence. Within the memory of many persons now living it was entirely absent; for Annual and General Conferences were made up exclusively of "preachers." In some sections of the country this rigid rule is now somewhat relaxed, but how meagre is "lay representation" in any Conference! In opposition to all these aristocratic forms of church government, and in practical condemnation of them all, the independent form presents itself, inviting examination and challenging admiration for what it does in giving suitable prominence to the members of a church. They are not ciphers, but the depositaries of the governmental power that Christ has conferred. Independency accepts this fact and claims it as one of its superior advantages.

4. Another advantage is seen in the appointment of church officers.

These officers are of two classes pastors and deacons. The former are in special charge of the spiritualities, and the latter of the temporalities, of the churches. Who can be so competent to choose these officers as the churches themselves? "With the scriptural qualifications for the two offices as given by inspired men, cannot the churches best decide who among them should fill those offices? Can they not tell who are men of such Christian integrity and sanctified common sense as will most probably, if not most certainly, "use the office of a deacon well"? So also as to pastors. These are to "watch for souls as they that must give account," and who are so well qualified to select the men to preside as the churches to be presided over? Shall they not decide who shall watch for their souls and for the souls of the impenitent around them? Are they not best prepared to say who among them possess the moral and the spiritual requisites, as enumerated by Paul, for the office of bishop? As to the intellectual qualification implied in the words "apt to teach," who can so satisfactorily tell that a man is apt to teach as those who have been taught by him? The independence of the churches, as illustrated in the appointment of their officers, must commend itself to the common sense of all unprejudiced persons. The advantage of this form of government over every other must be apparent. The great thing, however, to be said for it is that it accords with the New Testament.

5. It furnishes the most effectual preservative from doctrinal error.

Doubtless many persons will at once dissent from this view. They suppose that a consolidated church, embracing a province or a kingdom, is the best protection from the inroads of heresy. They think that the very compactness of such a church must resist the subtle influences of error, however penetrating those influences may be. Is this so? Has it been historically true? Was it true of the Church of England when Lord Chatham said that it had "a Calvinistic creed, a Popish liturgy, and an Arminian clergy"? Is it true now, when various false doctrines receive not only toleration, but encouragement, and when the mere existence of what are termed "Broad Church" views implies that the very foundations of orthodoxy are disturbed? No; the Church of England with its u Thirty-Nine Articles," more than three centuries old, is vulnerable to the assaults of false doctrine. Its strong ecclesiastic bands, riveted by Parliamentary enactments, create a compactness which gives greater facility to the infectious diffusion of error. "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." This is true whether the lump be large or small; but the danger is greater where there is one large

mass than where there are many that are small. Far be it from me to say that a church with the independent form of government may not become corrupted by heretical doctrines. History would falsify such a statement; but the corruption of one such church would have no necessary connection with the corruption of another. Indeed, the very independence of the churches might be, and if they were in a proper spiritual state would be, utilized in preventing the spread of the doctrinal corruption. On the other hand, a consolidated church, coextensive with a state or a kingdom, would furnish few if any facilities for arresting the tide of error when once set in. A local church, under a sense of its responsibility, is quick to detect the first appearance of vital heresy and to stamp it with censure. If the heretic sees his error, confesses it, and renounces it, the evil is at an end; if he persists in it, the church withdraws its fellowship from him and he becomes comparatively powerless for mischief. Suppose such a heretical minister to belong to the Presbyterian Church. He first disturbs the local congregation, then the Presbytery, then the Synod, and finally the General Assembly. Thus he has one opportunity after another to make known and to defend his false doctrines; so that the Presbyterian form of government, instead of preserving from doctrinal heresy, may, in the sense indicated, promote it. Who does not see that church independence is the best preservative from doctrinal error? Dr. Hodge is said to have expressed his wonder at the uniformity among Baptist ministers as to matters of doctrine, in view of the independence of Baptist churches. Perhaps his philosophical mind overlooked the fact that the uniformity is promoted by the independence.

I have referred to the withdrawal of fellowship on the part of a church from a heretic as a means of arresting the spread of doctrinal error. Another thing deserves mention: Where an entire church becomes heretical in doctrine or disorderly in practice, other churches, in the exercise of their independence, may withdraw their fellowship from it, and thus confine its injurious influence to its own narrow limits. Whether, therefore, we consider doctrinal error in connection with an individual church-member or in connection with a church itself, the independent form of government is the best security against its contagious encroachments. Nor is this all.

6. It secures, also, more satisfactory corrective discipline.

There is no perfection in this world. It may be sought more hopefully among the churches of the saints than elsewhere, but even there it will be sought in vain. All that is said in the New Testament about corrective church discipline implies the imperfection of church-members. This imperfection often shows itself in greater or less degrees. In its ordinary manifestations it must be borne with. Christian love and Christian forbearance require this. Sometimes, however, a church-member so violates his Christian obligations as to grieve his brethren, who admonish him and labor in the spirit of meekness to restore him. Ordinarily, they are successful and the offending brother is happily reclaimed. This is not always the case; in some instances it becomes the duty of a church to pass an act of exclusion. This, as we have seen, the New Testament not only authorizes, but requires. In a case of this kind the offender is arraigned and the charge or charges, with distinct specifications, are presented. The church sits as a Christian jury and hears all the testimony in the case. The arraigned brother has every opportunity to explain and rebut, if possible, the testimony against him. The church is disposed to give him the benefit of all doubts, but after a full hearing of the matter is convinced that the glory of God and the honor of his cause demand the exclusion of the brother. He is therefore excluded. The act of exclusion may offend him and not satisfy his kindred and partisan friends; but is it practicable to administer corrective discipline so satisfactorily

in any other way? The man has been tried by his peers and found guilty. These peers, too, are of the "vicinage," and fully competent to understand and appreciate all local circumstances bearing on the case. Does not the civil law mean something in providing for "a jury of the vicinage"? There is profound significance in the independence of each church, so far as the trial and the exclusion of a guilty member may be concerned. While, therefore, it cannot be said that the independent form of church government secures an absolutely satisfactory corrective church discipline, it may be said that the discipline so provided for is the most satisfactory that can be had.

7. It cherishes a sense of individual responsibility. This is a matter of great importance, for Christianity is an intensely personal thing. It has to do with men in their individual relations to God. There is no such thing as the regeneration of masses of men, nor is there regeneration by proxy. The great change takes place in the individual heart. Nothing is more personal than regeneration. When the materials of a Christian church are reduced to units, the units are found in regenerated persons. There is personal repentance, personal faith, personal baptism. In making a profession of Christianity, personal obligations are recognized and publicly assumed. Church relations do not impair, but intensify, a sense of individual responsibility. An impressive consciousness of this fact is indispensable to a proper performance of church duties. To show that the independent form of church government cherishes a sense of individual responsibility, it is sufficient to say that all matters coming before a church are decided by the votes of the members. They vote as individuals; and, as a majority rules, no one can tell but his vote may be decisive. Surely, then, every vote should be intelligently given; and this view of the case is a strong argument in favor of sanctified intelligence. Questions of great importance must be decided. These questions not only involve the spiritual welfare of the church itself, but often have an important bearing on the local interests of the community and the general interests of the kingdom of Christ. Church-officers are chosen by the suffrages of the members. How essential that the right man be appointed as pastor! In order to this, church-members must be acquainted with the purity of his Christian character, and also with his doctrinal soundness. A vote referring to two points so vital as these must be given under a sense of responsibility. The influence of deacons has much to do with the condition of a church, and therefore the best men should be appointed to the office. A church too must decide what objects of Christian work should receive its encouragement and patronage. These objects may be so numerous that all of them cannot receive attention, and if so, there must be a selection of those deemed most important. What shall be the proportion of pecuniary aid given to Home Missions, Foreign Missions, Publication Work, and Ministerial Education, the church must decide. The decision is no trivial matter. It calls for a union of knowledge and piety. One of the most painful duties of a church is to deal in a way of discipline with unworthy members. In all the proceedings in such cases the laws of Christ are to be sacredly observed. These laws, then, must be understood that they may be intelligently applied. A member who is guilty of "disorderly conduct," and who fails to give satisfaction by penitence and reformation, must be excluded. It is a solemn thing to withdraw the hand of fellowship, and it must be done under a sense of responsibility. When, according to apostolic command, "a heretic "is to be "rejected," the act of rejection is to be performed by the church. A renunciation of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel demands this step. As a general thing, the members of a local church, having been regenerated by the Holy Spirit and justified by faith in Jesus Christ, are competent judges of sound doctrine. They may not understand many theological niceties, but they know the way of salvation. They "have an unction from the Holy One" (1 John 2:20). In view of all these considerations, showing what obligations

rest on church-members and what duties are required at their hands, I affirm with strongest emphasis that the independent form of government cherishes a sense of individual responsibility. These who have to decide great questions by their votes are in a responsible position. This fact impresses them; they cannot ignore it; they would not if they could. Their responsibility as church members is to the Head of the church the Lord Jesus Christ and it is stamped with all the sacredness of the blood of his atoning sacrifice. Let the church-member take his stand by the cross, remembering that he has been individually redeemed by him who died thereon, and he will cherish a sense of individual responsibility. He will feel the weight of the personal obligations resting on him. The doctrine of church independency will deepen his consciousness of these obligations; for it will teach him that he is not a cipher, but a man A REDEEMED MAN, and ere long to be A GLORIFIED MAN.

CONCLUSION. The foregoing pages show that there is something distinctive in the principles of Baptists. They differ from all other denominations; and the difference is so great as not only to justify, but to demand, their separate existence as a people. They are God's witnesses, and they are his only witnesses who "tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," on the points referred to in this volume. Should their testimony be suppressed, in what religious denomination could "the whole truth" concerning the subjects of baptism be found? Not one. The question, Who should be baptized? would receive an answer in positive conflict with the teachings of the New Testament. Who but Baptists declare "the whole truth" with regard to the exclusive baptismal act and the symbolic import of the act? If there are others, where are they? We know not. Nor do we know of any people, besides Baptists, who maintain "the whole truth" on the subject of a regenerated church-membership, embracing, as it does, the vital point that we come to the church through Christ, and not to Christ through the church and its ordinances. Baptists proclaim in the audience of the whole world that persons have nothing to do with church relations and gospel ordinances till they are regenerated. Among whom, except Baptists, is the doctrine of church independency fully exemplified? Throughout this broad land we look in vain for the exemplification. Truly, Baptists are important witnesses; for they testify important things, and theirs is the only testimony on these important matters. In view of the facts to which attention has been called in this volume, there are certain duties incumbent on Baptists, such as the following:

1. They should acquaint themselves more thoroughly with Baptist principles. The Baptist Year-Book for 1882 reports more than two and a third millions of Baptists in the United States. This is a large number, but it is sad to think that there may be in it many persons who cannot give a satisfactory reason why they are Baptists. Honesty and veracity would possibly require some to say, "We are Baptists because our fathers and mothers were." Some might have to say, "The Baptists were the leading people where we made profession of religion, and we joined them." Others, in telling the truth of the matter, might be obliged to say, "We became Christians in time of revival, and, as most of the converts united with the Baptists, we did so too." Others still would possibly find a suitable representative in the brother who said, "I liked the Baptist minister better than any other, and wished to be a member of his church."

What reasons are these for being Baptists! It is not necessary to say that such reasons should have no influence, but they certainly should not be decisive. Proper reasons for becoming Baptists are to be found in the New Testament. They will be found without being specially sought that is to say, if the New Testament is faithfully and diligently studied, the principles which distinguish

Baptists will be discovered. That these principles are in accordance with, and the outgrowth of, the teachings of Christ and the apostles is the conclusive reason why anyone should be a Baptist. Let these principles be understood and appreciated, and there will be decided Baptists. They will be Baptists because they can be nothing else. The plain teachings of Scripture will permit them to be nothing else. It is "a lamentation, and shall be for a lamentation," that any Baptists should have only a superficial acquaintance with the principles they profess. Such persons, whether few or many, need instruction that they may be intelligent Baptists, and that they may be able to give to everyone who asks them a reason for their faith and practice.

2. Baptists should be more zealous in the propagation of their principles.

Good principles are good things, but they have no self-propagating power. Principles are powerless apart from the persons who hold them. Baptists sometimes forget this. They are so confident of the correctness of their principles as to feel that all will be well. They think that their views, without any effort on their part, will commend themselves to general acceptance. They suppose that a good cause may be left to take care of itself; but no cause, however good, takes care of itself* Its friends must advocate it, and by their advocacy secure its triumph. Baptists must not forget that they are "fellow helpers to the truth." None of them should fail to give the "truth" their help. None should ever act as if they were ashamed of being Baptists. Their principles, when assailed, should never lack defence or vindication from them. Their silence, when they should speak, would be a culpable and an injurious silence. Baptists should be ready not only to meet and to repel attacks made on their principles, but should earnestly engage in the propagation of those principles. Leaving, on suitable occasions, their fortresses of defence, they should invade the domain of error and become actively aggressive. This is one fault of some of the Baptists of this generation that they do not zealously propagate their distinctive views. They should see to it that the truth as embodied in their distinctive principles is brought into direct, positive, constant, exterminating contact with the error opposed to those principles. What distinctive mission have Baptists, if this is not their mission? to present the truth in love on the matters wherein they differ from Pedobaptists. What is there but this that justifies their denominational existence and saves them from the reproach of being schismatics? If they have a right to denominational life, it is their duty to propagate their distinctive principles, without which that life cannot be maintained.

3. They should pray more earnestly for the success and triumph of their distinctive principles.

It is supposed by many that controversy drives away the spirit of prayer. Were this so, it would be very sad; for there would be no spirit of prayer. Controversy is a necessity, and will be so long as truth and error are in the world. There may not at all times be controversy going on in the technical sense, but really and truly there is always controversy when truth and error are in collision. God is on the side of truth. Baptists worthy of the name believe without a doubt that their distinctive principles are true. Hence they can in all good conscience appeal to God in prayer, and ask him to care for his own truth and vindicate it by giving it success. Active effort to inculcate and diffuse the truth should ever be preceded, accompanied, and followed by prayer. No principle is worth holding, the success and triumph of which cannot be consistently prayed for. Baptists, above all persons, should pray. Other denominations that capture infants in their cradles and claim them as "the baptized children of the church" are not so dependent on God for the continuance of their ecclesiastical life as are Baptists. For the latter there is no hope but in God no hope, unless he by

his Spirit regenerates 20 individuals of accountable years and thus fits them for membership in the churches. While Baptists must never fail to use means to disseminate their distinctive principles, they must call earnestly on God in prayer to give to those principles the success and triumph to which their importance and their value entitle them. There is wonderful efficacy in prayer. Let Baptists test its efficacy in connection with their distinctive principles.

I present only one point more:

4. Pedobaptists should candidly examine the distinctive principles of Baptists.

These principles are not understood by multitudes in Pedobaptist communities. It is supposed that immersion as baptism is the only thing specially characteristic of Baptists. Nor is this view confined to persons of ordinary intelligence. I have it from a perfectly credible source that General R. E. Lee not many years before his death said that he had just heard concerning the Baptists what surprised him namely, that they did not baptize infants! If General Lee had not known this all his life, what is to be said of persons of inferior intelligence? The General was an Episcopalian. Pedobaptists should inform themselves as to what Baptists believe. It would do them good, for it would give them important ideas on the subject of scriptural churches and Christian ordinances. Many of them, too, would be led to make a personal profession of their faith in the act of Christian immersion. It was an examination of Baptist principles that influenced Adoniram Judson, Luther Rice, Horatio B. Hackett, Alexander Carson, Baptist W. Noel, N. M. Crawford, D. R. Campbell, Richard Fuller, and many others, to renounce the errors of Pedobaptism, and to illustrate the spirit of obedience to Christ by being "buried with him in baptism."

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
 - 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net