

# *a community called ...*

This material has been provided by Asbury Theological Seminary in good faith of following ethical procedures in its production and end use.

The Copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy of reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

**By using this material, you are consenting to abide by this copyright policy. Any duplication, reproduction, or modification of this material without express written consent from Asbury Theological Seminary and/or the original publisher is prohibited.**

© Asbury Theological Seminary 2011



T H E  
O R D I N A N C E S:  
BAPTISM, FEET WASHING,  
A N D  
THE LORD'S SUPPER.

BY JOHN WINEBRENNER, V. D. M.

---

“Keep the ordinances as I delivered them to you.”—PAUL.  
1 Cor. 11:2.

---

HARRISBURG, PA.  
1860.

ENTERED according to Act of Congress, in the year 1860, by  
John Winebrenner, V.D.M., in the Clerk's office of the Eastern District Court of Pennsylvania.

---

STEREOTYPED BY  
JOHN F. WEISHAMPEL, JR., PUBLISHER AND BOOKSELLER,  
BALTIMORE, MD.

---

BY  
800  
W55x

## Preface.

THESE Sermons on the standing ordinances of our holy religion, were prepared as the conclusion of the first volume of a series of "Doctrinal and Practical Sermons," published in monthly numbers. By request, and for a wider and more general circulation, they are now also published in a separate form. As to the doctrine they contain, and their intrinsic merits to the Church and to the world—I am perfectly willing to let an intelligent and impartial public judge and decide. That they contain truth, without any admixture of error, in all respects, I do not affirm. But I do affirm that they detect and refute many gross errors, propagated for centuries, and also reveal and establish many precious truths, which are still hid from the eyes of the wise and prudent of this world. All I ask is, "come and see"—come and investigate—come and read, study, search and ponder the truth, and the truth only—in honest and good hearts. "I speak as to wise men—judge ye what I say."

I commend this little treatise on the Christian ordinances to the perusal of ministers and people, and to the gracious favor and blessing of our heavenly Father.

THE AUTHOR.

MAY 17, 1860.



# Contents.

## I. A SERMON ON CHRISTIAN BAPTISM;

### SHOWING :

1. Its Administrators.
2. Its Form.
3. Its Law.
4. Its Subjects.
5. Its Mode.
6. Its Design and Benefits.

## II. A SERMON ON FEET WASHING ;

### SHOWING :

1. Its Divine Institution.
2. The Time and Manner of Observing it.
3. The Design of its Appointment.
4. The Duty to Observe it.
5. The Benefits Accruing therefrom.
6. The Objections to it.

## III. A SERMON ON THE LORD'S SUPPER ;

### SHOWING :

1. The Nature of it.
2. The Design of it.
3. The Qualifications for it.
4. The Right and Duty to Keep it.
5. The Benefits of Receiving it.
6. The Guilt and Danger of Profaning it.





## THE ORDINANCE OF BAPTISM.

---

TEXT.—“Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.”—Matt. 28 : 19.

---

THERE are four great systems of religion in the world, namely: the Jewish, the Mohammedan, the Heathen, and the Christian.

The Jewish religion was originally of divine authority, and served as an introduction and guide to the Christian system. Hence, when the Messiah came and fulfilled all things which were written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning himself, the Jewish religion was abrogated, and what was not entirely abrogated was merged into the Christian religion.

The Heathen and Mohammedan religions are both false and corrupt forms and systems of religion, which are destined to pass away and give place to our heaven-descended and holy Christianity.

Christianity, therefore, is the only system of religion that is of God, and which is true and soul-saving. The evidences of its truth and authenticity are numerous, strong and irrefragable.

The forms and ordinances of the Christian religion, unlike those of false and spurious systems, are all plain,

solemn and rational. The principal ordinances are: Prayer, Fasting, Singing psalms and hymns, the gospel Ministry, the Sabbath, or Lord's Day, Baptism, Feet Washing and the Lord's Supper. The last three of these are monumental and symbolical. They were all designed to symbolize and represent the great facts of the Gospel. Baptism symbolizes and represents the burial and resurrection of Christ; Feet Washing, the humility and love of Christ, and the Lord's Supper, the sufferings and death of Christ. Hence, we see that these ordinances are signs and memorials of the great and leading facts and developements of the Gospel.— Christians, therefore, ought to study and show themselves well informed on these standing and commemorative ordinances of our holy religion. Christian ministers, also, ought to be diligent and careful to explain and enforce these institutions, so that the people may rightly understand and observe them.

As a minister of Christ and steward of the mysteries of God, we wish to present our views and opinions of these sacred ordinances, as we are wont to teach everywhere in every church. First, we will give our views upon the ordinance of Christian Baptism. Here we shall show,

- I. THE ADMINISTRATORS, FORM AND LAW OF THE ORDINANCE OF BAPTISM.
- II. THE ONLY PROPER AND QUALIFIED SUBJECTS THEREOF.
- III. THE SCRIPTURAL MODE AND MANNER OF ADMINISTERING IT, and,

#### IV. THE REAL DESIGN AND BENEFITS OF THIS SACRED RITE.

In accordance with this order and arrangement, we shall consider,

##### I. THE ADMINISTRATORS, FORM AND LAW OF THE ORDINANCE OF BAPTISM.

These are the first things which claim our attention in the discussion of this subject. First of all, we must have a properly qualified administrator. Then, in the next place, that administrator must have a suitable form and law to guide and direct him in performing the act. Hence, we shall consider under this head,

1. THE LEGAL ADMINISTRATORS,
2. THE SCRIPTURAL FORM, and,
3. THE ESTABLISHED LAW, OR RULE, OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

1. THE LEGAL AND PROPERLY AUTHORIZED ADMINISTRATORS OF THE RITE OF BAPTISM. Water baptism, as a religious ordinance, was practiced first by John, the harbinger of Jesus Christ. "He came," it is said, and he came by the highest authority, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. The reasons why he came baptizing the people were,

1. Because God sent him to do it.—(John 1 : 33.)
2. To make ready a people for the Lord.—(Luke 16 : 17. Acts 19 : 4.)
3. That the Messiah might be made manifest to Israel.—(John 1 : 31.)

The next administrator of the ordinance of baptism was the Messiah himself. At what particular time He first instituted His own baptism and commenced its ad-

ministration, we are not informed. It is likely, from what is said in the latter part of the third and the beginning of the fourth chapters of John, that He instituted and practiced this ordinance shortly after He was baptized by John in Jordan; for it is said, "after these things came Jesus and His disciples into the land of Judea, and there He tarried with them and baptized;" (John 3: 22.) It is also said, "behold the same baptizeth, and all men come to Him."—(verse 26.)—"Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John."—(ch. 4: 1.) Here, then, we have the first account of the administration of Christian baptism.

Here let it be observed that Christ first made, and then having made disciples, He baptized them. Herein He was a proper example for all His ministers in all ages, down to the end of time.

From the period above stated to the time of the Saviour's crucifixion, we have no further account of the administration of this ordinance. But immediately after our Lord's resurrection, and before His ascension to heaven, He took occasion to explain to them more fully the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.—Among other things, He said to them, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." In obedience to this command, the apostles went forth preaching the word, and baptizing all who received or believed it. From these facts and considerations, it is evident that John the Baptist, Jesus Christ and His apostles were the first administrators of water Baptism. But as Baptism was intended to be a standing and perpetual ordinance in the Church of God, down to the

end of time, Christ also ordained a standing and perpetual ministry, and charged them with the administration of His word and ordinances. Hence, all christian ministers, who are in regular and good standing in the Church, are the legal and properly authorized administrators of Christian Baptism. It was to them, as an order and standing class of officers in His Church, that Jesus Christ gave the commandment, "Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." This great commission, therefore, and the example of the apostles under it, warrant the belief that the right of administering Baptism belongs exclusively to the accredited ministers of the gospel.

The next thing to be considered, is,

2. THE FORM OF BAPTISM. There is but one form, and that form is but once recorded in the New Testament, for the administration of the ordinance of Baptism.—It is recorded in the text, and runs thus, "*Baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.*" This formula should be invariably used as it stands. It is short, yet very solemn and significant. There are some in the habit of changing it, so as to make it read, "In the name of God the Father, and of God the Son, and of God the Holy Ghost."—But as this variation and use of the form savors of the idea of three Gods, and is unscriptural, it should always be avoided. Others have thought the use of this form a mere matter of indifference; since we read of some who it is said were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, (Acts 8: 16;) and the apostle Peter merely commanded that the Gentile converts should be bap-

tized in the name of the Lord, (Acts 10 : 48.) But this is no proof that the form as recorded by Matthew was not used; for the phrase, "in the name of the Lord," &c., often denotes "according to His direction." Besides, the term *Kurios*, (Lord,) in the New Testament, answers to Jehovah in the Old, and is equivalent to the form, "Father, Son and Holy Ghost."

Let us now contemplate,

3. THE LAW OR RULE OF BAPTISM. This is *not*,

1. The doctrine and commandments of men, nor,
2. The practice of men, nor,
3. The feelings of men; but,
4. The Word of God.

There are some men who take for their rule the opinions of their fellow men; there are others who are guided by custom, or the practice of their church; and there are others again, who go by their feelings, or by the special movings of the Spirit in this important matter. All this, however, is erroneous. For it is evident that all the acts and ordinances of religion must have a scriptural warrant to prove their validity. Without this, the opinions and practices of men, however respectable or ancient they may be, will furnish no authoritative rule for us to go by. Our only law, or rule of obedience, in religious institutions, is the sovereign pleasure of Him who alone is the object of religious worship. Baptism is a religious ordinance; and as such was instituted, as we have seen before, by Jesus Christ. His will, therefore, and not the will of men, must be our only rule of conduct in this and all other religious rites. Now, His explicit will concerning this ordinance can be known only from the New Testament. This,

then, must be our *only rule* of procedure in this matter. And on reading the New Testament, we discover that the will of Christ in reference to Baptism may be learned in two ways, viz :

1. From positive precepts, and,
2. From plain examples.

To these, therefore, which are short and easy to be understood, we beg to refer our reader, with this hearty advice, *Do as thou readest*; for it is at every man's peril not to know when he can—and much more, not to do the will of God when he knows it.

We will now consider,

## II. THE SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

Baptism is a positive and standing ordinance in the Church. All positive and standing ordinances have certain fundamental and essential elements. The ordinance of Baptism has three essential elements: Author, law and subjects. The Author and law of Baptism we have already ascertained and considered. The legitimate subjects will be the next element of our investigation.

When a minister of Christ, as a qualified administrator of the ordinance of Baptism, stands ready to do his duty according to the *form* and *law* of the New Testament, then the question comes up, whom has he a right to baptize? or, who are the proper and qualified subjects of Baptism?

On this point there exists a far greater diversity of opinions among the professors of christianity, than on any part we have as yet discussed. But not to take up time by giving the views of others, we will here give our own.

We believe the proper subjects of Baptism are,

1. NOT INFANTS,
2. NOT CARNAL AND UNCONVERTED ADULTS ; but,
3. BELIEVING AND CONVERTED ADULTS.

1. INFANTS AND MINOR CHILDREN ARE NOT PROPER SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM. This will appear evident from the following considerations.

1. *Because they have not the requisite qualifications for the ordinance.*

2. *Because they can derive no benefits from it.*

3. *Because there is neither precept nor example for it in the word of God.*

1. *Infants are not proper subjects of Baptism because they have no entitling qualifications for it.* Baptism is an ordinance of the Church of God. *Believers only* constitute this Church. Infants, therefore, having no faith, can neither have title nor fitness for either the Church or its ordinances. For what is not of faith is sin. And without faith it is impossible to please God. —(Heb. 11: 6.)

That faith in Christ is a pre-requisite qualification of Baptism, is readily admitted by many respectable authors.

CALVIN says: "From the sacrament of Baptism, as from all others, we obtain nothing, except so far as we receive it in faith." —(Inst. book 4, ch. 15, sec. 15.)

WATTS says: "Faith and repentance were the great things required of those that were admitted to Baptism. This was the practice of John, this the practice of the apostles, in the history of their ministry." —(Berry st. Serm. v. 2, p. 177.)

HORNBECKIUS says: "Without faith, water baptism



cannot by any means be lawful; for the command is, *believe first, then also, and not otherwise, be baptized*; “he that believeth and is baptized,” (Mark 16: 16.) “Then they that gladly received the word were baptized.”—(Acts 2: 41.) In the next place,

2. *Infants are not proper subjects of Baptism, because they can derive no benefits from it.* That the washing away of original sin, a change of heart, &c., are not benefits derived from this ordinance, we shall prove hereafter, under the last head of our discourse. But that the answer of a good conscience and other spiritual benefits do accrue to the worthy receiver of it, we shall also show. Infants, however, cannot receive the answer or the testimony of a good conscience, &c., from baptism, and therefore they ought not to be baptized, until they can and do believe. But, infants are not proper subjects of Baptism,

3. *Because there is neither precept nor example for it in the New Testament.* This fact, likewise, is confessed by many eminent writers.

LUTHER writes: “It cannot be proved by the sacred Scriptures, that infant baptism was instituted by Christ or begun by the first christians after the apostles.”—(Inst. R’s and Vanity of Inf. Bap. pt. 2, p. 8.)

FULLER, an Episcopalian minister: “We do freely confess, that there is neither express precept nor precedent in the New Testament for the baptizing of infants.”—(Inf. Bap. Adv. p. 71.)

SAMUEL PALMER: “There is nothing in the words of the institution, nor in any after accounts of the administration of this rite, respecting the baptism of infants. There is not a single precept for, nor example of this

practice, through the whole of the New Testament.”—  
(Ans. to Dr. Priestley’s Addr. on the Lord’s Supper,  
p. 7.)

LIMBROCK: “There is no instance that can be produced, from whence it may indisputably be inferred that any child was baptized by the apostles. The *necessity* of infant baptism was never asserted by any council before that of Carthage, held in the year 418.”—  
(Com. Sys. Div. book 5, ch. 22, sec. 2.)

BAXTER, that pious and eminent divine, says: “If there can be no *example* given in Scripture of any one that was baptized without the profession of a saving faith, nor any precept given for so doing, then we must not baptize any without it. But the antecedent is true—therefore so is the consequent. In a word, I know of *no one word* in Scripture that gives us the least intimation that anybody was baptized without the profession of a saving faith, or that gives the least encouragement to baptize any upon another’s faith.”—(Disp. of Right to Sacr., p. 149.)

DR. WOODS says: “We have no express precept or example for infant baptism, in all our holy writings.”

PROF. STUART says: “Commands, or plain and certain examples in the New Testament, relative to it, [infant baptism,] I do not find.”

NEANDER says: “That *Christ* did not establish infant baptism, is certain.”

Now, such being the state of the case, the *burden of proof* rests on those who maintain that infant baptism ought to be practiced. And, indeed, if there is neither precept for, nor example of infant baptism to be found in the sacred Scriptures, then infant baptism must be

without a divine warrant, and consequently cannot but be unlawful and displeasing to God. “For what man,” says Mr. Baxter, “dare go in a way which has neither *precept* nor *example* to warrant it? Can that be obedience which has *no command* for it? Is not that to supererogate and to be righteous overmuch? O, the pride of man’s heart, that instead of being a law-obeyer, will be a law-maker! For my part, I will not fear that God will be angry with me for doing no more than He has commanded me, and sticking close to the rule of His word, in matter of worship; but I should *tremble to add or diminish!*” —(Plain Scr. Proof, p. 24, 303.)

These arguments and considerations appear to us to prove beyond the power of contradiction, that infant baptism is unscriptural.

The advocates of this scheme, however, allege sundry arguments in favor of it, which we will here briefly state and answer. The right of infant baptism is generally defended by the following arguments:

1. That it is not forbidden in the New Testament.
2. That an express command is unnecessary, since other things not commanded are legally observed.
3. That it may be inferred from several Scriptures.
4. That it is sanctioned by the conduct of the apostles in baptizing households.
5. That baptism has come in the room of circumcision.
6. That infant baptism was uniformly practiced by the early christians.

1. It is said, “It is not forbidden to baptize infants, and therefore they are to be baptized. And the reason is plain: Pede-baptism was practiced among the Jews,

in the admission of proselytes. Christ took it into His hand, as He found it; therefore there was need of a plain and open prohibition that infants and *little children* should not be baptized, if our Lord would not have had them baptized."—(See Clark's Com. at the end of Mark.)

This argument is founded on false premises, to wit: That pædo-baptism was a practice among the Jews, and that John and Christ took it in hand as they found it. Where is there any evidence of this? We have no account of such a *Proselyte* or *Jewish Baptism*, either in the Old or New Testament. The argument, therefore, is good for nothing.

The erudite OWEN says: "The opinion of some learned men, that Christ borrowed the rite of baptism from that which was then in use among the Jews, is destitute of all probability. For there is no mention of it in the Bible, none in Philo, or Josephus, nor in Church history. This Rabbinical opinion therefore owes its rise to the *Tanneræ*, or Anti-Mishnical doctors, after the destruction of their city."—(Orig. Nat. of Chur. p.36.)

Again, the New Testament does not *forbid* the admission of infants to the Lord's Supper, nor the invocation of saints, nor prayers for the dead, nor the use of holy water. But does this silence prove that these superstitions are lawful, and should be observed?

Besides, if infants are to be baptized, because it is not prohibited, then who can say aught against the Romish sacraments of Confirmation, Penance, Extreme Unction, Ordination and Marriage? For the Romanist can say, These sacraments are *not forbidden*, therefore they are lawful. And certainly the argument will hold as

good in the one case as in the other. But it is alleged,

2. That a divine precept is not necessary—since the first day of the week is observed as the Christian Sabbath, and since females are admitted to the Lord's Supper without an express command. This, like the former, is an empty and weightless argument. For, with respect to the observance of the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath, we would observe, 1, That the apostles and first christians observed the first day of the week as the *Lord's Day*, or as a day sacred to God.—(Acts 20: 7; 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2.) Hence we have their example, and example is authority as well as precept. 2. The change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, seems to have been foretold by the prophets.—(See Ps. 118: 22—24; Isa. 65: 17, 18.)

With respect to female communion, we have both precept and example. We have precept in 1 Cor. 11: 28, where it is said, "Let a man examine himself," &c. Here the word *man* (*anthropos*) includes females as well as males. Thus the term is often to be understood in the Scriptures. For instance, in John 3: 3, "Except *a man* [that is, *any person*, whether male or female,] be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Besides, female communion is authorized by the practice of the primitive Church. For we read that both men and women constituted the first church—that they had all things in common, and continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine, and in fellowship, and in *breaking of bread*, [i. e. the celebration of the Lord's Supper,) and in prayers. (See Acts 1: 13, 14; ch. 2: 42, 44; ch. 8: 12; 1 Cor: 10: 17.) So then, we have authority for observing the first day of the week as the

Christian Sabbath, and also for allowing women to go to the Lord's Supper; but we have no such authority for infant baptism.

3. It is argued that infant baptism may be inferred from sundry passages in the New Testament, as, from our Lord's commission to baptize all nations.—(Matt. 28: 19.) "Go teach all nations, baptizing them," &c. Here the advocates of infant baptism reason thus: "All nations are to be baptized; children are a part of all nations, and therefore children have a right to baptism."

But surely, if this mode of reasoning proves infant baptism, it will also prove the right of all men, without exception of state or condition, to this sacred ordinance.

On this principle, none, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether Mahommedans or Infidels, whether moral or immoral, no, nor the most base and abandoned, could be refused, but all would have to be baptized, for they all belong to nations. However, our Lord has guarded us against such a construction, by telling us who, in all nations, should be baptized, namely, *believers*.—(Mark 16: 16.) This is, moreover, evident from the fact, that the words, *panta ta ethne* (*all nations*) are of the neuter gender, whereas the pronoun *autous* (*them*) is of masculine, so that the antecedent to the relative *them* cannot be *all nations*. The Greek word here is *mathetem*, in the imperative mood, and is derived from the noun *mathetes*, which is the well known and frequent occurring word *disciple* in our language. Hence, its primary meaning is *to make disciples of*. And then these disciples are to be baptized.

Again, the passages recorded in Matt. 19: 14, and Mark 10: 14, "Suffer little children to come unto me,"

&c., are brought forward as furnishing authority for infant baptism. But surely, these passages prove nothing in favor of infant baptism. Not a word is said here of baptism. But on the contrary it is said, they were *brought to Him that He should put His hands on them*, and pray; and that He should *touch* them, &c.—This was done, agreeable to a custom among the Jews, that whenever a person of dignity and piety visited them, they would present their children to him, to receive a blessing from his hands. The phrase, “for of such is the kingdom of heaven,” must be understood in a figurative sense, as meaning such as are *like* to children for humility, contentment, meekness, modesty, &c.—(See Matt. 18: 2.) So Barnes in his note on this place, says, “The kingdom of heaven evidently means here *the Church*, and ‘of such as these,’—that is, *of persons with such tempers as these*—is the Church to be composed.” The English edition of the Polyglot New Testament (New York, 1832) also gives the true sense. “Of such is the kingdom of heaven,” that is, “*of persons resembling children in disposition*, having their innocence, simplicity, humility, teachableness.”

The passage in Acts 2: 39, “The promise is to you and to your *children*,” is further urged as authority for infant baptism. It is said, “The promise here referred to is that which was made to Abraham and to his seed, and these were to a great extent infant children.”

But, from the connection of this text, it is very clear and evident that the apostle meant “*the promise of the Holy Ghost*.” This promise, as given by the prophet Joel, he had just rehearsed and explained in the hearing of the people. It seems most natural, therefore, to

understand the apostle as referring to *this* in the aforementioned passage. And as he makes no mention of Abraham or of any promise made to him, it is unnatural and forced to interpret it as referring to the promise made to Abraham and his seed.

By the word *tekna*, translated *children*, the apostle did not mean *infants*, but the *offspring* or *posterity* of the Jews in general. Thus the term is often used in the Scriptures, and especially in reference to the congregation of Israel. And that this is the meaning of the above word is obvious from the prophecy of Joel, from which it is quoted, and in which the same persons are called *sons and daughters*, and are described as those who were to *prophesy, see visions, and dream dreams*, which infants cannot do.

Another passage referred to as containing further countenance of infant baptism, is recorded in Rom. 11: 16—"If the first fruit be holy," &c. By the "first fruit" and the "root" here spoken of, the apostle did not mean Abraham and his posterity, but the apostles and first converts to christianity; and as these were Jews, they are called the natural branches engrafted into the good Olive Tree, (i. e. Christ and the means of grace;) and inasmuch as they were the first among the Jews who believed in Christ, they constituted not only the first fruit, or a kind of sample and pledge of the future and final conversion of their Jewish brethren, who were cut off and rejected; but also the root and foundation of the Gentile converts, called the wild branches, who should in any age or place, by faith, be grafted in among them, into Christ, the good Olive Tree. But there is not an iota said here about baptism, and of



course the passage can make nothing in favor of infant baptism.

There is one more passage, which is often mentioned as giving a claim to church privileges, and so to baptism. We allude to 1 Cor. 7: 14, "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife," &c. Here they reason thus: "They that are holy are proper subjects for baptism; children are said to be holy, and therefore they are to be baptized." But the idea of holiness being communicated from parents to children is in direct contradiction of Scripture and fact. Besides, if children, by virtue of this holiness, have a claim to baptism, then much more their unbelieving parents, since they are said to be sanctified before them: "The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife," &c. Why, then, is not the unbelieving husband baptized as well as the child?

But this is to be understood not of federal, but of matrimonial holiness. The word "to sanctify" among the Jews, is frequently used to signify *to espouse*, or *to marry*. In this sense the term is to be understood in this text, as the connection plainly shows. The Corinthians, it seems, wished to know whether a converted partner might legally continue to live with an unconverted or unbelieving one; or whether, on the conversion of the one party, they must separate. Now it was the apostle's object to show that inasmuch as both parties were at the time of their marriage unbelievers, and as such were lawfully married to each other, and therefore their marriage was valid and could not be annulled by the conversion of one of the parties; "else," says he, "were your children unclean," (that is, illegitimate;)

“but now they are holy,” (that is, lawful.) This text has nothing to do with baptism.

PROF. STUART remarks on this passage: “*It cannot mean* that the children are made the proper subjects of baptism; for if this were the case, then the unbelieving husband or wife would be made so by the believing party.”

BARNES, in his exposition of the passage, agreeing in the main with the above, remarks: “There is not one word about baptism here—not an allusion to it; nor does the argument in the remotest degree bear upon it.”

But it is said,

4. That infant baptism may be concluded from the practice of the apostles in baptizing households. As this argument is thought to be of particular weight, it is frequently and much insisted on. But by examining the few instances of household baptism recorded in the New Testament, we shall find several things in the accounts given of these families, which do not comport with infants, and which therefore invalidate this argument, and make it more than probable that there were no infants in any of these families.

The first family commonly instanced, is Cornelius and his household, (Acts 10: 48.) But it is evident that there were no infants among these first Gentile converts. For, just before their baptism, *they all heard the word—they all received the Holy Ghost—and they all spoke with tongues and magnified God.* Yea, and after they had been baptized, *they prayed the apostle to tarry with them.* This plainly shows that these persons were not infants.

The next instance is that of Lydia and her household, Acts 16: 14, 15. But surely there is no argument here in favor of infant baptism. For it is not known whether Lydia was single or married; and if she was married, it is not certainly known that she had children, and if she had, it cannot be proved that any of them were in a state of infancy. And even upon the supposition that she was a married woman—that she had children, and that some of them were in a state of childhood—yet it does not at all seem likely that she would have brought them along with her, from Thyatira, her native place, even down to Phillippi, a distance of about three hundred miles, to sell purple, and perhaps transact some other business, for which purpose it seems she had hired a house, during her stay at Phillippi. It is reasonable, therefore, to suppose that her household consisted of clerks or servants, whom she had employed to assist her in transacting her business. At any rate, it is evident from the fortieth verse, that her household consisted of persons who are called “brethren,” and who were capable of being comforted by the apostles. All of which makes it highly improbable that there were any infants in her household.

Another instance is the baptism of the Phillippian jailor and his household, (Acts 16: 29—34.) But that the jailor’s household consisted of believing adults, and not of infants, is evident from three facts expressly declared. 1. From the fact that they were all *taught*—(verse 32)—“and they spake to him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in the house.” 2. From the fact that they all *rejoiced* in the Lord. 3. From the fact that they all *believed* in God. “He set meat be-

fore them, and rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house." All of which show there can be no argument derived from this scripture in favor of infant baptism.

The last instance is the household of Stephanas, (1 Cor. 1: 16.) That this household consisted of believers in Christ and of such only, cannot be disputed. For it is said in 1 Cor. 16: 15, "they were the first fruits of Achaia," that is, the first converts in those parts, and they that *addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints*.

These are all the instances of household baptism mentioned in the New Testament. And from the examination of them we see that they furnish no argument for infant baptism; but, on the contrary, a very forcible one in favor of adult baptism.

But to proceed further, it is urged,

5. That Baptism has come in the place of circumcision. This argument is often used, and on it great stress is laid. But why? Is it because it is such a potent argument, or because there is so much Scripture evidence of it? If so, we would like to know where it is to be found. The thing is frequently asserted, but never proved. And the fact is, there is no direct evidence of it either in the Old or New Testament. It is a presumptive argument only.

It is commonly argued from the analogy between the Old and New Testament dispensations; or, from the unity of the Church under these two dispensations.—But to us it is not evident from the sacred writings that the Church of God is a continuation of the Jewish Church. What is generally called the Jewish Church were the people of Israel, or the congregation of the

Jews. These were never formed into a visible church state, analagous to the Church of God, They were merely typical of the Church of God. And as the portrait of a man is not the living man himself, so the anti-type is no identical continuation of the type. As Jesus Christ is the Mediator of a new covenant, He has made the first old. And as He is the Head and Founder "of a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands," that is, not of this building, so He has "made in himself, of twain," (to wit, of Jews and Gentiles,) "one new man." And now, in Him, "all the building, fitly framed together, groweth to a holy temple in the Lord."—(See Heb. 9: 11; Eph. 2: 15, 21.)

And again, if baptism had come in the place of circumcision, why were they both in practice at the same time? Why did Paul circumcise Timothy after he had been baptized?

Moreover, had the churches of Galatia understood that baptism came in the room of circumcision, is it not strange that they who had undoubtedly been baptized should still insist on circumcision? But, on the contrary, it is not to be wondered at, that when circumcision was laid aside, and nothing placed in its stead, they should still contend for that ancient rite.

It is strange, also, that the apostles who said so much against the judaizing christians, never mentioned that baptism came in the room of circumcision, which, if true, would have been an argument the best calculated to ease their minds in laying aside that ancient practice.

And if, according to the plan of some, the apostles and first ministers of the gospel practised infant baptism, because it was substituted for circumcision, is it

not very strange, that some of them should be so ignorant of this fact as to find it necessary to call a council, to inquire whether they ought still to practice circumcision? And when the apostles and elders came together to consider this matter, is it not very unaccountable that we find not so much as the least hint of baptism as having come in the place of circumcision? Why did they not settle the sharp controversy about circumcision, by telling the advocates of this rite that baptism had come in its place? This would have settled the question at once. But instead of this, there was not one word to this effect. We conclude, therefore, that they never viewed the matter in this light—that infant baptism was not known in the days of the apostles—nor the succession of baptism in the place of circumcision.

It is further argued, .

6. That infant baptism was practiced by the early christians. This argument of all others, has the least weight with us. 1. Because it is abundantly acknowledged by all Protestants, (some Episcopalians excepted,) and was the ground of the Reformation and Non-Conformity, that mere tradition, without precept or Scripture example, is no sufficient warrant, either for doctrine or practice.

2. Again, the ground of this argument is as fallacious as the argument is weak. Tradition concerning infant baptism has never been traced as far back as the apostolic age.

Tertullian, about A. D. 200, is the *very first writer* who mentions infant baptism, and *he opposed it*—"a proof," says Neander, "that it was not yet customary

to regard this as an apostolic institution; for had it been so, he would hardly have ventured to oppose it so warmly.”

It has been proved, and we believe beyond the power of contradiction, that Origen, who flourished in the beginning of the third century, was the first who asserted the right of infant baptism, and it is equally acknowledged, that Origen embraced several dangerous errors, and that his writings, translated by Ruffinus, were so corrupted, that the reader is very uncertain which is Origen's or Ruffinus'. See this subject fully discussed by Danverse, on Baptism, p. 133—150.

Hence, therefore, while from the earliest period, the baptism of *believers* appears on every page of history, her voice is dumb respecting *infant* baptism for *two hundred years* after Christ. Throughout the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles, and all the writings of the Fathers, down to Tertullian, there is not even an allusion to this subject.

But if infant baptism is unsupported by the word of God, how does it happen that this unscriptural thing has found so many zealous advocates, and has got to be so generally practised? Why, like episcopacy, confirmation, penance, &c., it has got in vogue by force and virtue of the commandments of men. No two of the prevailing pedit-baptist sects can agree as to the reasons for it—the class of infants to whom the ordinance is to be given—or the testimony in support of the practice. Various considerations on these points have been seized upon some by one sect, and some by another.—The arguments, however, of each, in favor of its own theory, and against those of its opponents, have clear-

ly shown the systems of all to be wholly baseless.— They are ingenious fictions, skillfully wrought sophisms, and are reciprocally contradicted and refuted.— For instance:

Wall, Hammond, and others of their school, claim that Jewish proselyte baptism is the foundation upon which infant baptism rests.

But Owen, Jennings, and many more, have clearly shown that Jewish proselyte baptism did not exist until long after the ascension of Christ. And they proceed to prove that it is authorized by the covenant with Abraham.

Knatchbull and his class derive it by analogy, from Jewish circumcision.

Beza, Doddridge and their associates, insist that children are holy, and must therefore be baptized.

Wesley and others teach that children are unholy, and must be baptized to cleanse them from their defilements.

Burder, Dwight and their followers, hold that the offspring of sanctified parents bear a peculiar covenant relation to God and the Church, and for this reason they, and no other children, are to be baptized.

Baxter, Henry and all that class of divines, baptize infants as the means of introducing them into the covenant of grace and the Church of the Redeemer.

The evangelical divines of the Church of England tell us that “the doctrine of infant baptism is deduced by analogical reasoning from the statements of Scripture applying more expressly to the case of adult baptism;” but the other class teach that baptism gives regeneration to the infant and must therefore be administered.



Many, however, and those among the most learned and candid, ingenuously confess that they find no *express* authority for it, except in "the general spirit of religion." Neander, for example, frankly says, "From the internal feelings of Christianity, which obtained an influence over men's dispositions, the custom of infant baptism proceeded."

J. W. Nevin places infant baptism on the ground of "a mystical force in the divine character of the Church." With Dr. Neander and others, he admits that it had no existence before the third century, but that the entire genius and faith of the early Church, from the very age of the apostles, lay in the direction of this practice, and fell towards it with natural gravitation, instead of looking or leaning in any other direction.

Thus contradictory, frivolous and suicidal, is the reasoning of those who essay to sustain infant baptism as a practice supported by the word of God.

Dear reader, we have now examined all the arguments of our pedit-baptist brethren in favor of infant baptism; and we most sincerely confess that the more we examine this subject, the more we are convinced that there is no sanction for it in the Scriptures; and that therefore it must be displeasing in the sight of God.

Having shown that infants have no scriptural right to christian baptism, and the many conflicting and contradictory reasons for it, we shall proceed to show,

2. THAT CARNAL OR UNCONVERTED ADULTS ARE NOT PROPER SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

By adults we do not mean persons of full age only,

but likewise all others who have come to the years of understanding, or who are in a ripe and right mind. By carnal and unconverted adults, we mean adults who have not believed to the saving of their souls. Such, we say, have no right to the ordinance of baptism.—This sentiment needs no proof. It is seldom controverted by serious and enlightened persons at the present day. We shall therefore not consume time here, in proving a point so generally conceded. However, to show the inconsistency of our pedo-baptist brethren, we would merely remind the reader of their theory and practice on this subject.

Their theory is, that children have a right to the ordinance of baptism, by virtue of the faith of one or both their parents. This general theory includes the entire household, whether the members be old or young, good or bad. Thus it is said; the jailor, Lydia and others, obtained a right to dedicate their families to the Lord by baptism. But then, when they come to practice upon this theory, they find themselves obliged very often, on account of the exceeding wickedness of some in the family to refuse the ordinance to the major part of the household, and peradventure allow it only to the mother and her infant. If the apostles, as they say, baptized households, (say, the wife, sons, daughters and servants,) when the head of each family only professed faith in Jesus Christ, then why do not our pedo-baptist friends do the same at the present day? Why do they now refuse to baptize the wicked children of believing parents, if it be true what they say, that children have a right to church membership and consequently to baptism, by virtue of the faith of their parents? Thus,

what they set up in theory, they upset in practice. But, inasmuch as they agree with us that unconverted or unbelieving adults, whether children of believing parents or otherwise, have no right to the sacred ordinance we are treating of, we shall not dwell here, as we have already said, but go on to say,

3. THAT BELIEVERS ARE THE ONLY PROPER SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

The truth of this position will fully appear, if we consider,

1. *The command of Christ.*
2. *The practice of the primitive Church.*
3. *The history of the Church during the first centuries.*

1. *The command of Christ*, as recorded in Matt. 28: 19, 20, and Mark 16: 15, 16, plainly shows that the subjects of baptism are to be adult believers. For the people are first to be *taught*, then they that *believe* are to be baptized.

Again, the terms of the Commission, while they enjoin the baptism of believers, do most certainly exclude the baptism of any but believers. If we commission our agent to do any given act, or piece of work, and he goes and does another act, or another piece of work, entirely different from what we appointed him to do, does he not violate his commission? So the commission granted by our Lord, directs his ministers to baptize believers, and them only. Hence, it excludes all others; and therefore, to administer the ordinance to any others is to act without the authority of Christ and against His instructions.

That none but believers are entitled to baptism is also evident from the concluding direction of the Commis-

sion, "Teaching them," &c. The candidate is supposed to be old enough to be taught the other institutions of the gospel. This is agreeable to the views of many learned and pious men who were not immersionists.

GROTIUS: "Christ properly requires teaching the first elements of Christianity as *preceding* baptism; which also was always used in the Church previous to that ordinance."

JEROME, the most learned of all the Latin fathers, says: "They *first teach* all nations; then, when they are taught, they baptize them; for it cannot be that the body should receive the sacrament of baptism, unless the soul has before received true faith."

CALVIN: "Because Christ requires teaching before baptism, and will have believers only admitted to baptism, baptism does not seem to be rightly administered except faith precede."

SAURIN, the celebrated French orator, says: "In the primitive Church, instruction preceded baptism, agreeably to the order of Jesus Christ, 'Go teach all nations, baptizing them,' &c."

BAXTER, speaking of the Commission: "This is the very commission of Christ to his apostles for preaching and baptizing, and purposely expresseth their several works in their several places and order. Their first task is, by teaching to make disciples, which by Mark are called believers. The second work is to baptize them. The third work is to teach them all other things which are afterward to be learned from the school of Christ."

It is no uncommon thing in these days, for men to

reverse the order of God, and place baptism before teaching and faith. And yet no one, who carefully reads the commission given by Christ to His ministers, can fail to observe that Christ places both teaching and faith anterior to baptism. Can those, therefore, be lawfully baptized, whose baptism is older than their faith? or, in other words, who were baptized before they believed? We answer, no. Their baptism being unscriptural, is null and void. The character ascribed to the baptized in the New Testament, goes also to establish the same fact. They are said to be “not of this world”—to have “put on Christ”—to be “saints”—to be “the sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty”—the “elect of God through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth”—“the faithful in Christ Jesus,” &c., &c. Now, this general description of character shows very clearly that they had been taught to believe to the saving of their souls.

2. *The practice of the apostolic Church confirms this truth more fully.* When we examine the accounts given us of every baptism in the New Testament, we shall find that the subjects are characterized as believers.—To prove this fact, we shall briefly notice the several accounts of the baptizings on record.

1. It is said of them who were baptized on the day of pentecost, that “they who gladly received the word were baptized,”—(Acts 2: 14.) Receiving the word and believing it mean the same thing. And mark, “as many,” not more, not their children, but just as many “as received the word were baptized.”

The next account of baptism we find, is recorded in Acts 8: 12. “But when they believed Philip preach-

ing the things concerning the kingdom of God, and in the name of Jesus, they were baptized, both men and women." Here we find that the Samaritans first believed, and when they did so, and not before, Philip baptized them, both men and women.

In the same chapter, we find an account of the eunuch's baptism. He, also, was a believer in Christ, before Philip consented to baptize him. For it is said, (Acts 8: 36—38,)—"And as they went on their way, they came to a certain water, and the eunuch said, See, here is water: what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still; and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him."

Another account of baptism we have recorded in Acts 10: 48. These again, were all believers. It is affirmed of Cornelius and his friends, that they "believed on the Lord Jesus Christ." The duty of believing on Christ was the principal thing insisted on by Peter, in his sermon. "Christ," said he, "hath commanded us to preach to the people, that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins."—(verses 42, 43.) Now, that they were not only hearers, but doers of the word, is evident from chap. 11: 17, where it is said, "Forasmuch, then, as God gave them, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, the like gift as he did to us, what was I that I could withstand God?"—And in chap. 15: 8, it is said, "God bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did to us."—

And then, in the 47th verse of this chapter he asks this question, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" These passages clearly and conclusively prove two things:

1. That the individuals addressed were neither infants nor carnal adults, but truly and soundly converted persons.

2. That water baptism and the baptism of the Spirit are two distinct and separate things; and that spiritual baptism ought to precede water baptism.

The cases of Lydia and the jailor, we have already noticed, and found them and theirs to be believers.

In Acts 18: 8, we have an account of the conversion and baptism of the Corinthians. These also were believers; for it is said, "and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized." Here is the ancient order of things. First, they *heard*; secondly, they *believed*; and thirdly, they were *baptized*. This ought always to be the order of things.

Thus we might proceed with the examination of every account of baptism mentioned in the Scriptures.—But those we have mentioned may suffice to show that the subjects always were believers, and not infants and unbelievers. But,

3. *Church history might be further adduced as evidence of this fact.* This argument, however, we shall not insist on. The Scriptures are, and ought to be, sufficient for every religious purpose. Yet, as our opponents often quote the writings of the Fathers during the first centuries of the Church, in support of their cause, and thus blindfold the people with the doctrines

of men, we would merely mention this argument as rebutting testimony. But as we are for having all religious principles and duties to rest on scriptural evidences, we shall not trouble our readers long with these "traditions of the elders." However, let us add a few :

Gregory Nazianzen, born in the year 318, whose parents were christians, and his father a bishop, was not baptized till near twenty one years of age.

Chrysostom, also born of christian parents in the year 347, was not baptized till near twenty one years old.

Bishop Taylor says that St. Ambrose, St. Heizom, and St. Austin were born of christian parents, and yet not baptized till the full age of a man and more.—(See Wall's Hist. Inf. Bapt., ch. 2, sec. 10.)

We have now considered the administrators, form, law and subjects of baptism. We shall therefore proceed to contemplate,

### III. THE SCRIPTURAL MODE AND MANNER OF ADMINISTERING BAPTISM.

This is,

1. NOT BY SPRINKLING OR POURING OR WASHING ; but
2. BY IMMERSION, OR DIPPING.

1. NOT BY SPRINKLING, POURING OR WASHING. The original Greek answering to the English word *sprinkle*, is *rantizo*; as the following places will show, viz: Heb. 9: 13, 19, 21; ch. 10: 22; 12: 24; 1 Pet. 1: 2. If the action of sprinkling was meant, the word which signifies that action would have been used, but is not in reference to the ordinance of baptism; and therefore sprinkling is not baptism.

We are aware that the text recorded in Isa. 52: 15,



“so shall he sprinkle many nations,” &c., and also the passage in Ezek. 36: 25, 26, “Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you,” &c., are sometimes brought forward, to prove that sprinkling is the proper mode of administering the rite of baptism. But neither of these passages have the least allusion to baptism. The sprinkling of clean water, &c., has a direct allusion to the sprinkling of the blood of Christ under the gospel dispensation.

The Greek word translated *to pour* is *cheo*, and its compounds, as a little attention to the Greek will plainly show. See Matt. 26: 7, 12; Mark 14: 3; Luke 10: 34; John 2: 15; Acts 10: 45; Rev. 16: 1, 2, &c.—The action of pouring is referred to upward of one hundred times in the Bible, but in no instance is the word *bapto* or *baptizo* used. Neither is *ekkeo* ever used in reference to the ordinance of baptism. *Ballo* is used to *thrust, cast, shed into or upon*. *Katakeo* to *pour on*.—*Ekkeo*, to *pour out*, and *spikeo*, to *pour in*. These terms not being used in connection with this ordinance, baptism, therefore, does not and cannot mean pouring.

Those who plead for pouring as the proper mode of administering baptism, take their argument from the gift of the Spirit. “The Holy Ghost,” say they, “is given, by pouring out or falling upon, and therefore, to baptize means to pour.” But in answer to this, we observe, that it is nowhere said that Baptism is an emblem of the gift or outpouring of the Holy Ghost. “When the Spirit was promised by pouring, it was used metaphorically to signify the abundance of it to be enjoyed under the New Testament. Hence, the descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of pentecost is neither expressed

by sprinkling nor pouring, but by being shed forth." The Spirit was not merely poured on them, but shed forth in them—"They were all filled with the Holy Ghost." This argument is invalid, because erroneous, and therefore proves nothing. It is begging the question. It is an attempt to make the Bible speak more than it contains. "The Holy Spirit is said to be poured out, upon the same principle that God is said to have arms, and to come down from heaven." It is speaking after the manner of men.

The text 1 John 5 : 3, is also mentioned by some as a proof of baptism by sprinkling or pouring. But we cannot see where it lies. The word water may signify the gospel, as it does elsewhere. And thus the Spirit, through the word, applies the blood of Christ to the believer, and these three concur in witnessing that he is a child of God ; and thus, if he submits to baptism, he further receives the witness of a good conscience toward God.

The Greek words commonly used for *washing* are, *louo*, *pluno* and *nipito*. See Matt. 11 : 17 ; Mark 7 : 3 ; John 13 : 10 ; Acts 22 : 16 ; 1 Tim. 5 : 10 ; Rev. 7 : 14. The term *louo* refers more generally to the washing of the body of an individual ; *pluno*, to the washing of his clothes ; and *nipito*, to the washing or rinsing of his hands, face or feet. Now, none of these words, or their derivations, are ever used in reference to the ordinance of christian baptism. The conclusion, therefore, is irresistible, that if the terms expressive of the idea of sprinkling, pouring and washing, are never used by the sacred writers in reference to the ordinance of water baptism, then no one of these actions amounts to a valid or Scriptural baptism.

“However, it is sometimes said, that the word *baptizo* signifies to *wash*, as well as to *immerse*; and for proof an appeal is made to Mark 7: 2—8, where the washing of hands, pots, cups, &c., is mentioned: But no argument can be taken from this passage in favor of any other mode than immersion. Every Jew knows that whatever is to be purified by water, whether cups, tables, or beds, it must be by immersion.” It is evident that the washing here spoken of was not a common, but a ceremonial washing, which was always performed by immersion, and not by sprinkling or pouring. Hence, we read, Lev. 11: 32, “And upon whatsoever any of them when they are dead doth fall, it shall be unclean, whether it be any vessel of wood, or raiment, or skin, or sack—whatsoever vessel it be, wherein any work is done, it must be *put into water*.” Not sprinkled, or have water put on it, but it must be put in the water.

Hence, we read also in Heb. 9: 10, of divers washings, or baptisms, as it is in the original. Paul here, like Mark, is speaking of ceremonial cleansing.

When a person was ceremonially unclean, he was required to wash his clothes and bathe himself in water. See this repeatedly commanded in Lev. 15: 5—11, and elsewhere. On this account, every family who could afford it, had a tank, or bath house.

Washing as a mode of baptism is not insisted on, as it is seldom or never practised amongst us. The fact is, there are no solid arguments in favor of it. Hence, the most our pedo-baptist friends do, when they come to treat on this point of our subject, is to cavil, or raise objections against immersion. At the same time, most of them are candid and fair enough not to object to im-

mersion as being unscriptural, but as to its being the *only* proper mode of baptism. This, then, being the point at issue, we shall proceed to establish the fact,

2. BAPTISM IS RIGHTLY ADMINISTERED ONLY BY IMMERSION.

This we shall endeavor to prove by the following arguments:

1. *From the meaning of the word baptism.*
2. *From the typical and figurative baptisms mentioned in the Scriptures.*
3. *From several places chosen for the administration of baptism.*
4. *From the example of Christ.*
5. *From the practice of the apostles.*
6. *From the design of the ordinance.*
7. *From the history of the Church.*

That immersion is the scriptural mode of baptism, in its literal and proper sense, in the New Testament, we shall argue,

1. *From the proper and primary meaning of the word baptize.*

The Greek word for *baptizing* is *baptizontes*, a participle of the verb *baptizo*. This word is derived from *bapto*, which means primarily, to *dip*, *plunge* or *immerse*. *Bapto* has two meanings; the primary, *to dip*, the secondary, *to dye*. *Baptizo*, in its literal and proper sense, in the New Testament, and in the whole history of the Greek language, has but one meaning. It signifies to *dip*, or *immerse*, and *never has any other meaning*.—“Each of these words, therefore, has a specific province, into which the other cannot enter; while there is a common province in which either of them may

serve. Either of them may signify to dip, generally ; but the primitive cannot specifically express that ordinance to which the derivative has been appropriated ; nor the derivative signify to dye, which is a part of the province of the primitive. That both of these words mean to dip, plunge, or immerse, we shall prove,

1. From the common consent and admission of all the best and most respectable lexicographers, ancient and modern.

2. From the testimony of the best linguists and learned men of all parties.

1. The best lexicographers of all ages define *bapto* and *baptizo* to mean to *dip*, to *immerse*.

SCAPULA, a learned foreign lexicographer of the 16th century, says, "Bapto and baptizo—to dip, to immerse ; also to wash, to dye, because these are done by immersing."

ROBERTSON, of the 17th century, defines baptizo by the words, "*mergo* and *lavo*," (Latin,) meaning in English, to immerse, to wash.

SCHLEUSNER, a learned and distinguished German lexicographer, says, "These words bapto and baptizo signify, 1, To immerse, to dip in water ; 2, To wash, or cleanse by water, because for the most part, a thing must be dipped into water that it may be washed."

PARKHURST says, "Baptizo first and primarily means to dip, to immerse, to plunge in water.

DONNEGAN defines baptizo to mean "to immerse, to submerge, to saturate."

STOKIUS, another master critic and great linguist, says, "Baptizo properly means to dip, to immerse in water."

The same thing we prove,

2. From the testimony of the best linguists and ablest critics of Europe and America.

We begin with the testimony of the great Reformer.

LUTHER says, "The term baptism is a Greek word.—It may be rendered *a dipping*, as when we dip something in water, that it may be *entirely* covered."

CALVIN: "The very word baptize, however, signified to immerse; and it is *certain* that immersion was the practice of the ancient Church."—L. 4, ch. 15, sec. 19.

BEZA: "Christ commanded us to be baptized, by which word, it is certain, immersion is signified. To be baptized in water signifies no other than to be immersed in water."

WESLEY: "Mary Welch was baptized, according to the custom of the first church, and the rules of the church of England, by immersion."—See J. Wesley's Journal.)

DR. GEORGE CAMPBELL, a Scotch Presbyterian, who has given us a valuable translation of the gospels, with learned critical notes. The word *baptizein*, both in sacred authors and in classical, signifies to dip, to plunge, to immerse."

DR. CHALMERS: "The original meaning of the word baptism is immersion; and the administration of it in the apostles' days, was by an actual submerging of the whole body under water."—(See Chalmer's Lectures on Rome, ch. 6.)

DR. A. CLARKE: "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 a parallel, Acts 8: 38, 'Philip and the eunuch went down into the water,' &c.'—(See Notes on Baptism at the end of Mark.)

GILL: "This word in its first and primary sense signifies to dip, or plunge into; and so it is rendered by our best lexicographers, *mergo, immergo*, to dip, or to plunge into. And in a secondary consequential sense *abluo, lavo*, to wash, is used, because what is washed is dipped, there being no proper washing but by dipping.

PROF. C. ANTHON, of New York, says, "There is no authority, whatever for the singular remark made by Rev. Dr. Spring, relative to the force of *baptizo*. The primary meaning of the word is to dip, or immerse; and its secondary meanings, if ever it had any, all refer, in some way or other, to the same leading idea.—Sprinkling, &c., are entirely out of the question."

It is said of Naaman, (2 Kings 5: 14,) "He went down and *dipped* himself seven times in Jordan." In the Hebrew the word *taval*, and in the Greek *baptizo*, to dip, or to immerse, are used.

PROF. STUART, of Andover Theological Seminary, says, "*Bapto* and *baptizo* mean to dip, plunge or immerse into any liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note, are agreed in this."

Having thus shown that *bapto* and *baptizo* and their cognates, mean in their proper and primary sense, to dip, plunge or immerse, we are at once brought to the conclusion, that the Lord Jesus Christ, in giving His commission, intended to make immersion essential to baptism. For it is undeniable, that *baptizo* is the word

chosen and employed by the Saviour and His apostles in the New Testament, to express the action called baptism, and this word, as we have seen, all admit, in its primary and proper meaning is to IMMERSE, to DIP.—Hence, it is irresistibly evident from the meaning of the word *baptizontes*, the term used by Christ in His commission, that no action but *immersion* is a valid Christian baptism.

We argue in favor of Baptism by immersion,

2. *From the typical and figurative baptisms mentioned in the Scriptures.* There are several:

1. There is a typical baptism spoken of in 1 Pet. 3: 20, 21. Here the apostle refers to the waters of the flood, of which he makes baptism the antetype. Now, the idea is this: when God opened the windows of heaven and broke up the great deep from below, the ark, which was a large hollow vessel, with Noah and his family in it, were for a time as it were buried, or covered and immersed in water. This answers to immersion in baptism, but not to a few drops of that element, when sprinkled on the face of a person.

2. There is a figurative baptism spoken of in 2 Cor. 11: 1, 2. “I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and all were baptized to Moses, in the cloud and in the sea.” For a clew to this text, see Exodus 14: 19. Now, observe: the Israelites were walking through the sea on dry ground; “the waters were a wall to them on their right hand and on their left”—the cloud hung over them. Thus covered, they passed through the sea, and so are said to be baptized. This figure fitly represents baptism by immersion, but



not by sprinkling ; for had there been much sprinkling or pouring, the ground could not have remained “dry.”

3. The sufferings of Christ are called a baptism.—(Luke 12 : 50.) “I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished.” The word is here used to show the greatness and abundance of His sufferings. For as in baptism when rightly administered, a person is immersed or plunged into water, so our blessed Lord and Saviour was immersed or plunged into an ocean of sufferings. “But how trifling would the sufferings of Christ appear, if baptism meant mere sprinkling.”

4. The extraordinary donation or gift of the Holy Spirit is called a baptism. (Acts 1 : 5.) On this text the learned Casdoleon observes: “Regard is had in this place to the proper signification of the word *baptizein*, to immerse, or dip ; and in this sense the apostles are truly said to be baptized, for the house in which this was done was filled with the sound which came from heaven, and by consequence with the Holy Ghost, so that the disciples were immersed in it.”

3. *From several places chosen for the administration of baptism.* The first place that we read of in which baptism was administered, is the river Jordan, (Mark 1 : 5, &c.,) “And there went out,” &c. The next place that is mentioned is Enon. John, it is said, was baptizing in Enon, near Salim, BECAUSE THERE WAS MUCH WATER THERE, and they came and were baptized.—(John 3 : 23.)

Now, if sprinkling or aspersion could have answered the end of the institution, what need would there have been for going to a place where there was much water, yea, and down into a river?

That this is a convincing argument in favor of baptism by immersion, is acknowledged by many unprejudiced pedo-baptists themselves.

CALVIN, on John 3: 23, says, "From these words it may be inferred that baptism was administered by John and Christ by plunging the whole body under water."

LIGHTFOOT, another eminent pedo-baptist writer, remarks: "That the baptism of John was by plunging the body, (after the same manner as the washing of unclean persons, and the baptism of proselytes,) seems to appear from those things which are related of him, viz: that he baptized in Jordan; that he baptized in Enon, near to Salim, because there was much water there; to which that seems to be parallel, (Acts 8: 38,) 'Philip and the eunuch went down into the water,' &c."

Further, we argue the truth of the position under consideration;

4. *From the example of Christ.* An account of His baptism we find in Matt. 3: 13—17, and Mark 1: 9—11. In Matthew the account runs thus:

"Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan to John, to be baptized of him. But John forbade Him, saying, I have need to be baptized of Thee, and comest Thou to me? And Jesus answering, said unto Him, Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered Him. And Jesus, when He was baptized, went up straightway out of the water; and, lo! the heavens were opened to Him, and He saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and lighting upon Him: and, lo! a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

By Mark it is narrated thus: "And it came to pass

in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan. And straightway coming up out of the water, He saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit, like a dove, descending upon Him. And there came a voice from heaven, saying, Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

Here in these inspired narratives it is said, that Jesus was baptized of John in Jordan, and when He was baptized, He went up straightway out of the water. These expressions make it very plain, that Jesus was immersed—and not sprinkled—by John in Jordan. This has been honorably confessed by Calvin and others. Calvin says, "Here we perceive how baptism was administered among the ancients; for they immersed the whole body in water."—(Com. on Matt. 3: 23; Acts 8: 23.)

The phraseology used in the above cited Scriptures seems to forbid the thought that Jesus was sprinkled of John in Jordan. "Was it ever known that any of our pedit-baptist brethren went down into a river, to sprinkle or pour water in the administration of the ordinance of baptism? Surely not! Nor should we have heard of 'going down into the water' and 'coming up out of the water,' if John and the apostles had administered the sacred ordinance by sprinkling or pouring. How strange it would sound to say, 'Jesus went down into Jordan and was sprinkled of John.' But nothing could be more intelligible and natural than to say, 'Jesus went down into the water, and was immersed by John in Jordan.'" But to evade the force of this strong and convincing argument, flowing from the example of our Lord, in favor of immersion, it is alleged by some that the Greek proposition *apo* means *from*, and that

the passage ought to be rendered, "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway *from* the water." And again, it is said, the prepositions *en* and *eis*, translated *in* and *into* may be rendered *by*, *at*, *to*, *unto*, &c. But then we would ask, where has there ever been a good translator of the Bible who has thus translated these prepositions? Luther, Doddridge, Van Ess, the translators of our English Bible, and many others, who have given us the best translations of the sacred scriptures have all rendered *apo*, *out of*, *en*, *in*, and *eis*, *into*. Certainly, these men understood the original, better than our modern quibblers and quack critics.

There are others again, who, finding that this kind of desperate caviling or fruitless criticism will not save their sinking cause, and who like drowning men will catch at anything to save themselves, tell us that our Lord was not baptized as an example to His followers, but that John thereby consecrated or set Him apart to the Priest's office; and that the consecrating or separating act, under the law, was always by sprinkling or pouring.

But in reply to this vague opinion, we would say that it is nowhere said that Jesus was consecrated a Priest by baptism. This is a mere supposition. It cannot be proved.

Besides, Jesus Christ was a priest after the order of Melchisedec, and not after the order of Aaron.—(Heb. 7: 17.) Now, Melchisedec was not consecrated or set apart to his office as a priest by baptism; nor were any belonging to the Levitical priesthood thus brought into office. The regular way of installing a priest, under the law, was (as we read, Numbers 8: 5—22,) by the

usual ceremony of purifying, and not by baptism. Baptism was never practised on such occasions. But "Jesus," it is said, "came from Galilee to Jordan to John, to be baptized of him."

This baptism was no priest-making ordinance. It was from heaven, and was chiefly designed to manifest the Messiah to men. Hence we hear John say, "And I knew Him not, but that He should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water."—(John 1: 31.)

Since, therefore, Christ is declared a Priest forever, after the order of Melchisedec, and as Melchisedec received no consecration to the priesthood, save his appointment of God—and as the priests under the Mosaic law, were never set apart to their office by baptism, we cannot agree with those who explain our Lord's baptism as a mere act of separation to the Priest's office. What violence party men will frequently do to plain precepts and precedents, given us in the Scriptures, in order to support their own favorite systems! But we observe a further argument in favor of immersion,

5. *From the practice of the apostles and the primitive churches.* "As the apostles of Jesus Christ were to form and organize His visible Church, our blessed Lord continued with them after His resurrection forty days, speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God. Among other subjects, baptism was doubtless fully explained to them: therefore, when they entered on their commission to preach, teach and baptize, a part of their teaching would consist in pointing out the nature, design, mode and subjects of baptism. And as it has already been proved in the preceding pages, from

the sacred scriptures, as well as from the concessions of pedo-baptists, that the word baptism throughout the whole of the New Testament signifies immersion only; and that John and Philip administered by immersion; and the Lord Jesus Christ himself went down into the water, and being immersed by John in the river Jordan, He straightway came up out of the water; and as the Saviour, the great Head of the Church, in His commission used the word baptism, to immerse, in preference to those words which signify to wash, pour or sprinkle; and as the apostles themselves, when speaking of this ordinance, invariably used the same word, (immerse,) we may certainly conclude that immersion was the only mode used by the churches they planted, and that it continued unchanged for some time."—(Frey's Essay.)

6. *From the design of the ordinance.* The design of baptism is to represent the burial and resurrection of Christ, and by consequence the ultimate resurrection of the body at the last day. That a burial and resurrection are represented by baptism seems quite clear from Rom. 6: 4, and Col. 2: 12. Now, as none can properly be said to be buried, unless put under ground, or covered over with earth, so none can properly be said to be baptized, but such as are immersed, or put under water; as nothing short of this can be a representation of the burial and resurrection of Christ and ours with him. A right understanding of baptism may assist us to comprehend the passage in 1 Cor. 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?"

Baptism was undoubtedly observed by the Corinth-

ians, and the apostle argues from their own practice.—As if he had said, What do ye mean by baptism? If the dead rise not at all, why then are you baptized for, or with reference to the dead? Why do ye keep up a figure or representation of a resurrection from the dead, if the doctrine be not true? If there be no resurrection, baptism is a mere idle, insignificant ceremony, and ye are inconsistent with yourselves to deny the doctrine, and still keep up by your baptism an emblem or representation of the resurrection from the dead.

The learned Samuel Clark thus interprets the passage —“What shall they that are baptized be the better, for that significant ceremony of rising again out of the water, after they had been as it were buried in it; which is being baptized for the dead; that is, to give assurance that after they are dead, they shall be raised again by the power of Christ.”

But, finally, we receive additional evidence in favor of immersion,

7. *From the history of the Church.*

We have remarked before, that this is no conclusive argument on either side of the question. We agree with Dr. Miller, on this subject, who says, “Historic fact is not divine institution. We do not therefore refer to the fathers in any wise as a *rule either of faith or practice*. We acknowledge the Scriptures alone, to be our rule. By this rule they themselves are to be tried. Of course the fathers cannot be considered the christian’s authority for anything. They are not infallible. Many of them are inconsistent, both with themselves and with one another. We protest therefore utterly against any appeal to them for conclusive authority on any subject.”

Nevertheless, we are aware that the history of the Church is sometimes appealed to, as a proof of baptism by sprinkling. But here again, for want of a rock, they must build on the sand. Ecclesiastical history bears a preponderating testimony in favor of immersion.

Equally strong and conclusive, on this point, are the practice and testimony of the Greek Church and of the Christian fathers. Hence, we prove here that *nothing* but immersion is christian baptism,

1. From the practice of the Greek Church.
2. From the testimony and practice of the ancient fathers.
3. From the testimony of the best writers and authors on Church history.

1. From the uniform practice of the Greek Church. The Greeks and the Greek Church have always, from the days of the apostles, practised immersion for baptism. In proof of this fact, we offer the testimony of the following authors :

DR. J. G. KING says, "The Greek Church uniformly practises the trine immersion, undoubtedly the most primitive manner."—(See Rites and Cer. of Gr. Ch.)

DR. WALL: "The Greek Church, in all the branches of it, does still use immersion." Again he says, "If we take the division of the world from the three main parts of it, *all* the christians in Asia, and *all* in Africa, and about *one-third* part of Europe practise immersion."

D. ROGERS: "None of old were wont to be sprinkled—and he betrays the Church whose officer he is, to disorderly error, if he cleave not to the institution, which is to *dip*. To dip is exceeding material to the ordinance; which was the usage of old, without exception of countries, hot or cold."



MR. WALL says that "the learned MR. GALE, [with whom he had a dispute on the mode of baptism,] knew that the examples of Scripture and other antiquity, and of all the eastern church to this day, were on the side of immersion, and that he had the disadvantage to plead for a way of baptism, of which the best he could say, was, that it was sufficient for the essence of baptism; but could not deny the other to be the fittest."—(Def. Hist. Inf. Bapt.)

The sensible remarks of MR. ROBINSON also deserve a place here: "Whether John the Baptist and the apostles of our blessed Lord baptized by pouring on water, or by bathing in water, is to be determined chiefly, though not wholly, by determining the precise meaning of the word baptize. A linguist determines himself by his own knowledge of the Greek language, and an illiterate man by the best evidence he can obtain from the testimony of others. To the latter it is sufficient to observe, that the word is confessedly Greek; that native Greeks must understand their own language better than foreigners, and that they have always understood the word baptism to signify *dipping*; and therefore from their first embracing christianity to this day, they have always baptized by immersion. This is an authority for the meaning of the word baptize, infinitely preferable to that of lexicographers; so that a man who is obliged to trust human testimony, and who baptizes by immersion because the Greeks do, understands a Greek word exactly as the Greeks themselves understand it; and in this case the Greeks are unexceptionable guides, and their practice is, in this instance, safe ground of action."—(Hist. Bapt.)

That the whole Greek Church, from the southern provinces of Greece to the northern extremity of the Russian empire, a Church, which in point of territory and population embraces nearly one-half of Christendom, that this Church has from the first introduction of the gospel to the present time, invariably practised immersion, is confessed by all and denied by none.—(See Frey on Bapt.)

Again, we prove this fact,

2. From the testimony of the Christian Fathers.—The term fathers is applied to eminent divines in the Church, who lived prior to the 6th century. The writings of these Fathers, as they are called, show clearly that immersion is the primitive mode of baptism.

BARNABAS: “We go down into the water, but come up out again.”

TERTULLIAN: “We go down into the water and are immersed three times, fulfilling something more than our Lord has decreed in the gospel.”

AMBROSE: “Thou wast immersed, [mersisti;] that is, thou wast buried.”

CHRYSOSTOM: “Our being baptized and immersed in the water, and our rising again out of it, is a symbol of our descending into the graves, and of our returning from them.”

Once more, we prove our point,

3. From the testimony of the best and most accredited authors on Church history.

DR. MOSHEIM: “Baptism was administered in this (the first) century, in places appointed and prepared for that purpose, and was performed by immersion of the whole body in the baptismal fount.”—(Ecc. Hist. v. 1, p. 46.)

“As to the outward mode of administering baptism, immersion, and not sprinkling, was unquestionably the original normal form. This is shown by the very meaning of the Greek words, baptizo, baptisma, baptismas, used to designate the rite. Then again, by the analogy of the baptism of John, which was performed *in* the Jordan. Furthermore, by the New Testament comparisons of baptism with the passage through the Red Sea, (1 Cor. 10: 2;) with the flood, (1 Pet. 3: 21;) with a bath, (Tit. 3: 16;) with a burial and resurrection, (Rom. 6: 4; Col. 2: 12.) Finally, by the general usage of ecclesiastical antiquity, which was always immersion, as it is to this day in the Oriental and also the Græco-Russian churches; pouring and sprinkling being substituted only in cases of urgent necessity, such as sickness and approaching death. Not till the end of the thirteenth century did sprinkling become the rule and immersion the exception. It must be a subject of regret, that the general discontinuance of this original form of baptism has rendered obscure to popular apprehension some very important passages of Scripture.”—(Schaff’s Hist. Apostolic Ch., p. 568—570.)

Every ecclesiastical writer of the first two centuries, who has had occasion to refer to baptism, positively affirms that it was administered by immersing the subject in water, in the name of the Trinity. Neither pouring nor sprinkling is ever named. The first reference to pouring was in the case of bed-ridden persons, as a substitute for the customary mode. It was termed clinical baptism; and if the subject recovered, it was properly administered by immersion.

We shall now proceed to consider,

#### IV. THE REAL DESIGN AND BENEFITS OF THIS SACRED RITE.

Here we shall notice,

1. THE DESIGN, and,
2. THE BENEFITS OF BAPTISM.

1. THE DESIGN OR INTENTION OF BAPTISM. This is not, as some suppose and teach,

1. To grant or confer the right of church-membership, nor,
2. To create or affix a public sign or badge of discipleship.

1. Baptism is not designed to confer the right of church-membership, or to initiate persons into the church. That this is the opinion of many, the following quotations will show:

“Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament—whereby the parties baptized are solemnly admitted into the visible Church.”—(Presbyterian Catechism.)

“All persons who are baptized are publicly and solemnly introduced into the family, and entitled in a peculiar manner to the name of God.”—(Dwight’s Theology, v. 4, p. 310.)

“Baptism is the initiatory sacrament, which enters us into covenant with God. By it we are admitted into the church, and consequently made members of Christ its Head. The Jews were admitted into the church by circumcision. So are the christians by baptism.”—(Wesley’s Works, vol. 9, p. 150.)

“The signification, or scope of baptism, is admission into the divine covenant and the Church of God.”—(Osterwald’s Christian Theology, p. 351.)

From these and other authors that might be quoted,

we see that many have supposed the design of baptism to be the admission of persons into the Church. But to err is human. And without doubt this opinion is erroneous. The term Church in its appropriate application to a religious use, is seldom or never used but to signify either the collective body of christians throughout the world, or else a distinct local and individual society of christians united together by mutual consent for purposes of religious worship. The former is usually called the general Church, and the latter a particular church.

Now, baptism does not make us members of the general or universal church, for this is done by regeneration and adoption. When a person is born again, he is made a member of and admitted into the kingdom or Church of God. This admission into the general church should always be previous to baptism.

Again, baptism does not admit us into any particular church; for this is, or ought to be, done by mutual consent. It implies an application and admission.

When any person becomes converted, it remains optional with him to apply for church membership where he pleases; and it is optional with the constituted authority of every particular church to refuse or admit into the church those that apply for membership, as they please. So that a person cannot become a full member of any particular church but by agreement, or mutual consent. Hence, the opinion that we are made members of, or admitted into the visible church by baptism, is erroneous and indefensible.

2. Baptism is not intended to affix a public sign of discipleship. This has been contended for by some, but evidently without scriptural proof.

DWIGHT says, "Baptism is the public sign, by which the disciples of Christ are known to each other and to the world."

"All societies need indispensably some mark of distinction; some mode, by which the respective members shall be known to each other. This sign ought always to be publicly known, definite, unequivocal, significant, solemn, safe from being counterfeited, always the same, acknowledged by the whole body, and therefore established by authority which cannot be disputed. This sign is the seal of God, set by His own authority upon those who are visibly his children."

LIGHTFOOT says, "Baptism is a distinguishing sign between a christian and no christian, between those who acknowledge and profess Christ, and Jews, Turks and pagans, who do not."

But we would ask, how can a person from a distance be recognized as a disciple of Christ by the sign of baptism, among any who were not eye-witnesses to the administration of the ordinance? All societies, it is true, need some marks of distinction. "Nations," says Dr. Fuller, "have their escutcheons, their crest and ensigns; armies have their shields and banners; and families their heraldry, with its arms and quarters and bearings. In the days of Christ, Jews and Gentiles had their emblems. Different schools and academies are distinguished by symbols, devices and mottoes." So ought also churches and christians to have their distinguishing mark or badge. And this mark or badge, as Dr. Dwight says, "ought always to be publicly known, safe from being counterfeited, always the same." But such a sign, or badge, is *brotherly love, not baptism*.—

(See John 12: 34, 35.) If, then, baptism is not designed to create church membership, nor to be a sign or token by which christians are to be known to each other and to the world, what is the real design of it?

1. *Baptism is designed for a visible putting on of Christ, or as an open and public profession of Christ.*

2. *It is to show forth and commemorate His burial and resurrection.*

3. *It is to represent the christian's interest in Christ.*

1. Believers are bound to avow their faith, and make an open profession of their allegiance to Christ the Lord. This is done in Baptism. Every person in submitting to this ordinance confesses Christ. Herein every christian testifies and evidences his faith and obedience. Thus John's disciples showed their obedience of faith in the coming Messiah, by receiving His baptism. And thus christians show their obedience of faith, by putting on Christ, or by openly confessing Christ in baptism.

2. It is to show forth or represent the burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ. As in the Lord's Supper, we show forth and commemorate the sufferings and death of Christ, so in baptism we show forth and commemorate His burial and resurrection.

In proof of the fact that baptism is a symbol of Christ's death and resurrection, we quote 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 with Him by baptism into death; that as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should also 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.”—(Rom. 6: 3—5.) “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?”—(1 Cor. 15: 29.) “Buried with Him in baptism, wherein ye are also risen with Him.”—Col. 2: 12.) These passages demonstrate two things:

1. That baptism is rightly administered by immersion, because no other baptism plainly signifies either a burial or a resurrection.

2. That it is a standing memorial and representation of Christ’s burial and resurrection; and of our death to sin, and resurrection to newness of life. In proof of this, we cite the following pedo-baptist authority:

BLOOMFIELD, a German author, in his Critical Digest on Rom. 6: 4, says, “There is here plainly a reference to the ancient mode of baptism by immersion; and I agree with Hoppe and Rosenmuller, that there is reason to regret it should have been abandoned in most christian churches, especially as it has so evidently a reference to the mystic sense of baptism.”

ARCHBISHOP TILLOTSON: “Anciently those who were baptized were immersed and *buried* in the water, to represent their death to sin; and then did rise up out of the water, to signify their entrance upon a new life.—And to these customs the apostle alludes, Rom. 6: 3—5; Col. 2: 12.”

JOHN WESLEY: “‘Buried with Him,’ &c. Alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion.”—(Wesley’s Notes on Rom. 6: 4.)

DR. WHITBY: “It is expressly declared here, (Rom. 6: 4, and Col. 2: 12,) that we are buried with Christ in



baptism, by being put under water; and that immersion has been observed by all christians for thirteen centuries."—(Notes on Romans.)

DR. A. CLARKE: "The baptism which they (the first christians) received, they considered as an emblem of their natural death and resurrection. This doctrine St. Paul most pointedly preaches, Rom. 6: 3—5."—(Notes on 1 Cor. 15, 29.)

3. It is designed to represent the christian's interest in the Saviour. Christian baptism, as taught in the New Testament, is an outward sign of an inward and spiritual grace; and that grace is the result of the gospel and the Spirit upon the heart of a believer—it is the grace in the heart. It is to show that by His word and Spirit, we have been spiritually crucified, buried and quickened in Christ. It is a symbol of spiritual washing and of the cleansing of the soul by the blood of Christ, and its renovation by the Spirit of God. Hence we read, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into His death?"—(Rom. 6: 3.) "For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body."—(1 Cor. 12: 13.) "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ."—(Gal. 3: 27.)

To be baptized into Christ means to be converted, and to evidence or certify that by baptism. Such, therefore, have put on Christ, that is, they have assumed His character and interests, or pledged themselves to imitate Him.

Let us now proceed to notice,

## 2. THE BENEFITS OF BAPTISM.

The benefits which accrue to those to whom this ordinance is dispensed, are,

1. *Not the remission of sins.*
2. *Not regeneration, or the renewal of the heart, but,*
3. *The answer of a good conscience toward God, and,*
4. *The privileges and immunities of the kingdom of God.*

1. *Not the remission of sins.* The forgiveness of sins is no fruit, or benefit of baptism, as some have supposed.

“The first benefit,” says Mr. Wesley, “we receive by baptism is the washing away of the guilt of original sin. Infants need to be washed from original sin, and therefore, they are proper subjects of baptism, seeing in the ordinary way, they cannot be saved, unless this be washed away by baptism.”—(Wesley’s Treatise on Baptism.)

“Original sin is forgiven us in baptism, not as though it were no more, but that it is not imputed to us.”—(Augustine and Luther, Apol. and Conf.)

“Baptism is the sacrament of repentance or remission of sins, and of the implanting of the Holy Ghost. It incorporates the penitent sinner in the church, entitles him to the privileges, and binds him to all the duties of this communion.”—(Schaff’s Hist. Ch., p. 22.)

This erroneous sentiment needs no refutation. It is repugnant to the analogy of faith, and contrary to christian experience. It is by the blood of Christ, through faith, that a soul is justified or pardoned. So that baptism is neither the procuring nor instrumental cause of forgiveness.

But to prove this dogma, we are referred by its advocates to the following texts, viz: Acts 22: 16, “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;" and Acts 22: 16, "And now, why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."

With regard to the first-text, we would remark, that its true meaning turns upon the use of the preposition *for*. This word does not mean *to procure*, but in *token of*. As an illustration, take an instance: When Christ had cured a certain man of the leprosy, He said to him, "Go thy way; show thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleanliness those things which Moses commanded, for a testimony to them." Now the things which this leper was to offer in sacrifice, according to the law of Moses, were to be offered *for* his cleansing—that is, not *actually*, but *formally*, as the legal and visible token thereof. So with baptism.

With regard to the other text, it must also be understood to mean *receive baptism* as an act *expressive* of forgiveness, or the washing away of sins. This is all it can and does mean; for the reason that baptism is not the appointed means of *procuring*, but of *testifying* forgiveness of sins.

2. *Regeneration, or a change of heart, is no benefit of baptism, as some teach.*

"The Church of Rome has long taught that regeneration is inseparably connected with this ordinance; and that the ordinance is absolutely necessary, at least in all ordinary circumstances, to the existence of regeneration."

From that church this scheme has spread with some variation through some Protestant churches.

"Baptism is considered by the Lutheran church as the washing of regeneration. Thus Paul calls it, Tit.

3: 5. We therefore find that in the primitive church baptism and regeneration were used as synonymous terms. Thus in christian baptism, although we are by nature born in sin and of sinful parents, yet in baptism God condescends in mercy for Christ's sake to adopt us as His children and to take us under His particular care."—(Hist. Doct. Discip. Lutheran Ch., p. 102.)

"By baptism, we who were by nature children of wrath, are made the children of God. By water, then, as a mean, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again."—(Wesley's Treat. on Baptism.)

In the Episcopal form of baptism, as used in Great Britain, the minister says, "This child is regenerated and grafted into the body of Christ's Church."

Thus we see how far even learned and good men may be carried away with the error of the wicked. For that this doctrine is error, we think is quite clear and evident from Scripture and experience. A few remarks will establish this.

1. The doctrine is universally contradicted by the Scriptures. They universally teach us that man is renewed or born again by the Spirit and truth of God.—The Spirit is the great agent, and the truth, or word of God, is the instrument of regeneration. Besides, it is expressly said that baptism is *not the putting away of the filth of the flesh*, (1 Pet. 3 21.) "But this point is at once placed beyond all reasonable debate by the following declarations of Paul, 1 Cor. 14: 17, "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius. For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." Now nothing is more certain, than that, if baptism ensures or proves regeneration, Paul would

never have thanked God that he had baptized none of the Corinthians, save Gaius, Crispus and the household of Stephanas.

2. This doctrine is contradicted by experience. Judas, Simon Magus, Ananias, Sapphira and others, were all probably baptized by inspired ministers, and yet, who will say that they were all regenerated? In like manner, thousands have been regularly baptized by authorized ministers in every succeeding age of the Church, whose after lives proved beyond a doubt that instead of being regenerated, they were still like Simon Magus, in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity. Thousands of christened youths at the present day demonstrate by their ungodly lives that instead of being born again and on their way to heaven, they are carnal, sold under sin and on the way to hell.

“Thus in every point of view, the doctrine that baptism is regeneration—that it ensures or proves it—that it is attended or followed by it, is erroneous, unfounded, and unscriptural.”

3. *Baptism is the answer of a good conscience toward God.* So says the apostle, 1 Pet. 3: 21, “The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us.” Here the apostle does not mean to say that baptism does *actually* now save us, but that it does so *formally*, or *declaratively*. But he goes on to say, “not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God.” Note, it is not the act of procuring a “good conscience,” but the answer, testimony, or covenant of it towards God. And here we may add what will not be denied, that no *mode* of baptism save that of immersion, will give permanently the

answer of "a good conscience." The frequent and numerous migrations from pedit-baptist ranks fully establish this point.

Further, a believer who is lawfully baptized is entitled to,

4. *The privileges and immunities of the kingdom of God.* The Scriptures uniformly teach us that the apostles inculcated the duty of baptism on each and every believer; and wherever any believed the gospel and were baptized, they were added to the church; and the church had all things common, as it respects ecclesiastical privileges. But the baptized had great rights and privileges. But this is not so now in many modern churches. Many add their children to the church by baptism, and then cut them off from nearly all the privileges of the church, until they get converted; and if they are never converted, they are excluded all their lifetime from every privilege of the church, except it be that of hearing the word, and in this they are no better off than the unbaptized. Now, who is so blind as not to see the glaring inconsistency of such a church polity?

We shall now conclude this discourse by presenting a brief summary of our whole subject, and by answering a few of the popular objections to immersion.

Under our first general head, we started out by showing the origin and Author of Christian Baptism. Then the legal administrators, form and law of the ordinance.

Under our second head, we considered the proper and scriptural subjects of baptism: showing negatively, who are not, and positively, who are proper subjects.

Under our third head, we discussed the action, or

mode of baptism, and showed that it was not the action of sprinkling, nor the action of pouring, nor the action of washing, but the action of immersion. The fact that immersion is the proper action we clearly and successfully established by showing,

1. That the word *baptizo* and its derivatives, as employed by the Saviour in the commission, signifies in its primary and radical sense, to immerse, to dip, or to plunge; and also, that it has never been translated, in any accredited version of the Scriptures, to sprinkle, to pour, or to wash.

2. That the figurative use of the word baptize proves immersion to be essential to the nature of baptism.

3. That the places chosen for its administration fully prove the same thing.

4. That the example of Christ, who was baptized by John in Jordan, and after His baptism came up out of the water, also demonstrates immersion; because no one will go into the water to be sprinkled, &c.

5. That the practice of the apostles and primitive christians confirms the fact that the action of immersion is the only scriptural baptism.

6. That the design of baptism goes to establish the same truth. And,

7. That church history corroborates this apostolic doctrine and practice.

Hence, therefore, in view of all these facts and arguments, we take the ground, without any fear of error or contradiction, that nothing but the action of immersion, religiously administered in the name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, is valid Christian baptism. The correctness of this opinion is most strikingly confirmed

by the fact that, from the days of the apostles downward, for a period of thirteen hundred years, we have an unbroken chain of evidence that the entire Church of God has practised immersion as the scriptural mode of Christian baptism. In connection with this, we affirm another fact: That baptism by immersion is now, and always has been the practice of a large majority of the Christian world. Besides, we still further affirm, that the validity of immersion has never been denied, except by a few, but always admitted by a large majority of christians, to be a valid scriptural baptism. Hence, if an immersionist changes his church relations and connects himself with an anti-immersionist denomination, he is never required to be sprinkled or poured, in order to membership. The validity, or lawfulness of immersion, therefore, forms no point of controversy. The real point at issue is whether sprinkling, pouring and washing are also to be recognized as valid acts, or modes of baptism. On this issue, we take the negative, and shall strenuously maintain it, until the affirmative is proven, which in our opinion is utterly impossible.

We shall now, in the last place, briefly answer a few popular objections brought against immersion. It is alleged,

1. *That baptism by immersion is often inconvenient and impracticable.* Either on account of the scarcity or total want of sufficient water in some countries; or on account of the extreme cold in other parts. If this forms a valid objection against immersion, then the scarcity or want of bread and wine in some parts of the world, may lie with equal force as a valid objection



against the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. But, when a thing is proved by sufficient evidence, no objections from difficulties can be admitted, except they involve an absolute impossibility. God's infinite wisdom has adapted all His commandments and ordinances to the various circumstances and conditions of mankind, in every age and country. The fulfilment of all righteousness may sometimes be attended with more difficulty in one country than another, yet in no country where men can live, are religious duties impracticable. It is objected,

2. *That immersion cannot be reconciled with the baptism of the three thousand converts, on the day of pentecost.* First, for the want of time, and secondly, for the want of water. In reply we say, First, it is not said that these three thousand converts were all baptized in one day, and in the next place, it is not true that there was a want of time or water. Peter commenced his sermon at nine o'clock in the morning; and suppose that it took him an hour to deliver it, then it would have been about ten o'clock by the time they commenced to baptize. This would leave them about eight hours to administer the ordinance. Now, suppose the seventy, whom Christ chose and sent out to preach, were present, (and it is more reasonable to suppose that than to suppose the contrary,) then we have eighty-two legal administrators on the ground. Three thousand candidates equally divided among eighty-two baptizers, would give to each about thirty-seven persons. Accordingly, the whole service might have been performed in less than half an hour. We baptized on the 1st of August, 1830, near Harrisburg, fifty-five persons in twenty-three minutes. So we see there was no want of time.

Again, it was not for the want of water. This baptizing took place at Jerusalem, where, besides the public conveniences for immersion, such as the pools of Bethesda and Siloam, there were many *mickwaoth*, or collections of water in the form of bathing houses, for the purification of unclean persons and vessels, &c., required by the law of Moses, and which was always by immersion.—(See Lev. 15: 16; Num. 19: 7, 8.) On the whole therefore, there is no weight in this objection.

3. *That immersion is only a mode of baptism, and that if a person has been baptized by one mode, it is sinful to be re-baptized by another.* This objection is entirely gratuitous—yea, more, it is deceptive and false. Immersion, properly speaking, is not a mode of baptism, but is that very action called baptism, and consequently the instituted ordinance of Christ itself. Hence, there is but one baptism; and if a person has by mistake performed another act, which is not baptism, he is in duty bound to rectify his mistake; and by doing so he commits no sin, but simply fulfils his duty. “All unrighteousness is sin, but he that doeth righteousness is righteous even as he is righteous.”—(John 3: 7.) Again,

4. *Immersion is objected to because there is not one explicit text to be found, which declares in so many words, that “The apostles baptized by immersion alone.”* This negative proof, we say, is unnecessary. If we prove, as we have done, that *baptizo* and its derivatives denote the action of immersion, and that this was the apostolic practice, then we have fully established the doctrine we contend for. If, therefore, another action is substituted for baptism, then that action must be proven. And if

the thing affirmed cannot be proven, then the proposition must fall, and the respondent cannot be required to prove a negative. Hence, no man has a right to found an objection to immersion upon the want of a proof text, declaring explicitly, that "the apostles baptized by immersion alone." It is tantamount to a demand to prove a negative. This is contrary to the rules of honorable debate. Every man is bound to prove what he affirms, or else give up the argument.

5. *Immersion is objected to, on the ground and by force of an improved translation of the Greek prepositions en, apo, eis, and ek.* The preposition *en* is translated *at*, so as to make the phrase, "baptized of him *in* Jordan," read "baptized of him *at* Jordan." (See Mark 1: 5, 9.) The preposition *apo* is translated *from*, so as to make the clause, "coming up *out of* the water," read "coming up *from* the water." (v. 10.) The preposition *eis* is translated *to*, so as to make the phrase, "they went down both *into* the water," read "they went down both *to* the water." (Acts 8: 38.) And the preposition *ek* is translated *from*, so as to make the sentence, "and when they were come up *out of* the water," read "and when they were come up *from* the water." (v. 39.)

This is a species of sophistry resorted to, to evade the force of an argument, drawn from the prepositions in the narratives referred to, in favor of immersion; and to make it appear that neither Christ nor the eunuch were immersed. But, after all, the sophism is a complete failure. For, the force of the argument does not rest so much on the meaning of the prepositions in the narratives as it does on the meaning of the word *baptize*.

John and Christ, Philip and the eunuch had of course to go down together *into* the water, in order that the baptizer might immerse the candidate. The mere fact of going *into*, or as the caviler says, *to* the water, proves nothing; but the word baptize shows that the act was done after they had got into the water.

It is true, the prepositions above named are sometimes translated as stated; but we would ask here, where is there one among the hundreds of translators of the sacred scriptures, who has ventured to give these prepositions, the aforesaid so-called improved translations? To our knowledge, there is not one to be found. This fact in itself considered is to our mind a clear proof that the whole thing is a sheer quibble.

Besides, look at the consequence of such criticisms. What would it prove true? Why, just what the infidel and universalist would like. For illustration, take an instance: "The rich man died, and *in* (*en*,) [*at*, *with*, *by*] hell, he lifted up his eyes." "Send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger *in*, (*en*,) [*at*, *with*, *by*,] water, and cool my tongue, for I am tormented *in* (*en*,) [*at*, *with*, *by*,] this flame."—(Luke 16: 23, 24.) Take another instance: "Joseph took Him (Jesus) down, and wrapped Him *in* (*en*,) [*at*, *with*, *by*,] linen, and laid Him *in* (*en*,) [*at*, *with*, *by*,] a sepulchre."—(Mark 15: 46.) "Our Father, who art *in* (*en*,) [*at*, *with*, *by*,] heaven."—(Matt. 6: 9.) See also, 7: 3; 10: 28; 12: 13; 13: 24; 15: 11; 18: 10; James 3: 3.

Next let us try *apo* by the new translation. "Mary Magdalene, out of (*apo*) [*of*, *from*,] whom He cast seven devils."—(Mark 15: 9.) "One born out of (*apo*) [*of*, *from*,] due time."—(1 Cor. 15: 8.) "Be instant in

season and out of (*apo*,) [of, from,] season."—(1 Tim. 4: 2.) Luke 8: 33; 11: 28; Acts 16: 18.

Again, let us try *eis* by the improved version, and see how it will read. "He poureth water into (*eis*) [to, at, for, by, &c.,] a bason."—(John 13: 5.) "He cannot enter into (*eis*) [to, at, for, by,] the kingdom of God."—(John 3: 5.) "I have no man, to put me into (*eis*) [to, at, for, by,] the pool."—ch. 5: 7. "These shall go away into (*eis*) [to, at, for, by,] everlasting punishment, but the righteous into (*eis*) [to, for, by,] life eternal."—(Matt. 25: 46.) "Zaccheus climbed up into (*eis*) [to, for, by,] a sycamore tree."—(Matt. 19: 14.) See also Matt. 18: 19; 20: 4; Rev. 26: 3, 14, 15.

Lastly, let us try *ek*, and see what it means. It does not mean *up from under*, as Brownlee ironically says. But it does mean *out of*. "And when they were come up out of (*ek*) [not of, or from,] the water."—(Acts 8: 39.) "Cast the beam out of (*ek*) [not of, or from] thy eye ..... the mote out of (*ek*) [not of, or from] thy brother's eye."—(Matt. 7: 5.) "Come out of (*ek*) [not of, or from] the man."—(Mark 5: 8; 15: 46.)

6. *Immersion is objected to, because Paul, Cornelius and his friends, the jailor and his family, were all baptized within doors.* In reply to this objection, we would say, that it is not said *where* they were baptized, whether in or out doors. We have as good a right to suppose that they went out, as another has to suppose that they remained within doors. And perhaps there was no necessity for going out of the house in either case; for all who have traveled in the East know that few large buildings are without tanks of water or bathing houses—and this is particularly necessary to preserve health in prisons, barracks, &c.

7. *It is further objected that immersion is dangerous to health.* In answer to this objection, we observe, that it has never been proved that immersion is dangerous to health. But suppose that even in some cases immersion might be hazardous to health, we have no authority to alter the mode of a positive institution. In cases of sickness, &c., it might be necessary to delay the administration of the ordinance, *as no time is specified*, and as God requires no impossibilities. But to say that immersion is wrong, because it might be injurious to the health of a few persons, and because some could not bear to be immersed at all, is as light and trifling as it would be to say that preaching is wrong, because it might be injurious to some to expose themselves to the inclemency of the weather in going to their appointments, and to others, to exercise their lungs much by speaking; that singing is wrong, because some cannot bear to sing, and others have not the gift to sing.—Now, as God does not require a man to speak or sing, when He has given him no ability to do so, neither does He require a person to be immersed, when through affliction or otherwise he is unfitted for it.

8. *Indecency has been pleaded as another ground for changing immersion to sprinkling.* But “who is this that replieth against God?” Objections like these are themselves indecorous; especially when they come from those who raise no objection against circumcision. And again, why have not the ladies “a great previous struggle with their delicacy” when they resort by thousands to Cape May and other sea-boards, where they bathe daily in the presence of gentlemen and a promiscuous crowd? Does a fashionable practice atone for and sanc-

tify its indecency? O what a fruitful source of *cavils* is a blind and prejudiced heart!

9. *Baptism by immersion is objected to*, (by A. Atwood) *on the ground that it would have to be repeated in all cases of restoration of backsliders*; and “which repetition would be unscriptural and absurd.” We say this conclusion does by no means follow from Mr. Atwood’s premises. His premises and conclusion are both defective. If a person has been lawfully baptized upon a profession of faith, and whilst in a state of grace, and he falls away, or backslides, he has only to do his “first works,” (not his christian duties,) in order to be restored; and when restored, he need not be re-baptized, for the reason that he did not backslide from baptism, but from the state and obligations to which he by baptism pledged his fidelity.

But does not this principle and rule more fully apply to Mr. A.’s theory and practice? If “baptism is an initiatory ordinance,” if “by it,” as Methodists teach, “we, who are by nature the children of wrath, are made the children of God,” then in case of apostacy, there must be a repetition of the ordinance, (though “unscriptural and absurd it be,”) in order to be again initiated and made a child of God. The correctness of *this* conclusion cannot be denied, as long as the premises are maintained.

As to his opinion that the Samaritans were baptized in an unconverted state, because they did not receive the Holy Ghost till afterwards, he is equally, if not more grossly mistaken. What! did Peter and John lay hands on sinners, and give them the Holy Ghost?—Surely not.

10. *It is moreover objected that baptism is non-essential.* To ascertain the truth or falsity of this objection, we must first learn what is meant by the word essential. It is defined by most of our lexicographers to mean “a thing necessary or very important.” That which belongs to the constitution or being of a thing is said to be essential. Accordingly, we hold to the essentiality of baptism in a two-fold sense.

1. We say it is essential to the validity of the ordinance to be immersed. In other words, immersion is essential to the right performance of the ordinance.—He that is not immersed, is not lawfully baptized.—Christ and the apostles commanded the action of immersion, and nothing else. Therefore we say, that those who are not immersed, have no valid and Scriptural baptism. This, we think, we have already clearly established in this discourse.

2. We hold baptism to be essential to the obedience of Christ. Christ as the King of the kingdom of heaven, requires voluntary, immediate, universal and constant obedience to His laws. “Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you.”—(John 15: 14.)—“Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.”—(Matt. 28: 20.) “Him shall ye hear (*obey* as the parallel reads, Deut. 18: 15) in all things whatsoever He shall say to you. And it shall come to pass, that every soul that will not hear (or obey) that Prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people.”—(Acts 3: 22, 23.) “Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves.”—(James 1: 22.) “Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.”—



(Ja. 2: 10.) These, and other texts of like import, very clearly show that baptism, if admitted to be a commandment at all, is essential to obedience. But,

3. *Is it essential to salvation?* We answer, we do not consider it essential to present salvation. We say that sinners ought to have a previous present salvation, that is, the remission of sins and peace with God, before they are baptized; and that baptism ought to follow, because of remission, and as the declarative sign or token thereof. But what will be the consequence if it does not? Must such believers as neglect to be baptized be lost? or can they, notwithstanding this neglect, hope to obtain future and eternal salvation? Before we reply to this question, if we are authorized to reply at all, allow us to propound a few. Can a believer knowingly or habitually neglect prayer, the Lord's Supper, or any other christian duty, and yet hope to inherit future and eternal salvation? When any of you can prove these things non-essential, and show clearly from the Bible, that men can get to heaven without observing these christian duties, then we will not hesitate to say that they may get there without baptism. But, how will you go about it? Take pen and paper, and draw up a list of arguments from the Bible, to prove the non-essentiality of prayer, baptism or the Lord's Supper, and see how many, and what kind of proofs you can find.

Again, can a man get to heaven, without refraining from all forbidden sins? Suppose a man abstains from drunkenness, swearing, fornication, theft and Sabbath-breaking, and from every other species of crime, except *lying*; and in justification of his practice, takes the plea

that lying is non-essential—can he be saved? You will doubtless answer, No. Why? Because lying is forbidden, and therefore to lie is a sin. Now, if the doing of a forbidden act is sin, and will exclude from heaven, who will undertake to say that the omission or neglect of a commanded act is no sin, and will not exclude from heaven?

All the difference that we can see is, that one is a sin of *commission*, and the other a sin of *omission*; and whether God will overlook the sin of omission in the matter of baptism; or in any other *positive* duty, and take delinquents to heaven, is a question we will leave our readers to decide.

## THE ORDINANCE OF FEET WASHING.

---

TEXT.—“Ye call me Master and Lord, and ye say well, for so I am. I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another’s feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you.”—John 13 : 13—15.

---

THE Roman Catholics tell us that there are seven sacraments, viz : Baptism, the Lord’s Supper, Confirmation, Penance, Extreme Unction, Ordination and Marriage. Protestants, on the other hand, generally hold and teach that there are but two sacraments, viz : Baptism and the Lord’s Supper. Both Romanists and Protestants, in our opinion, are equally in error, with regard to the number of these institutions. There are not seven sacraments as the Catholics say, nor are there but two, as the Protestants affirm. But there are three,

---

\* SACRAMENT—This word is not found in the Bible. It is derived from the Latin word *sacramentum*, and signifies an oath ; particularly, a military oath taken by Roman soldiers. Roman Catholics apply this term to certain religious ordinances, which they suppose are equivalent to the obligations of an oath, and by which grace or divine virtue is conveyed to the persons receiving them. Many Protestants believe and do the same thing. We object to the use of this word, in reference to religious ordinances, because it is unscriptural, and leads to error and superstition.

and only three, standing, symbolical and commemorative ordinances of divine worship, viz: *Baptism*, *Feet Washing*, and the *Lord's Supper*. The ordinance of Baptism we have considered and discussed in the preceding discourse. In this discourse we propose to discuss the subject of feet washing. In doing so, we shall consider,

- I. THAT FEET WASHING IS AN ORDINANCE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.
- II. THE PROPER TIME AND MANNER OF OBSERVING IT.
- III. THE OBJECT AND DESIGN OF THE INSTITUTION.
- IV. THE OBLIGATIONS INCUMBENT UPON ALL CHRISTIANS TO PERFORM THIS SERVICE.
- V. THE BENEFITS ACCRUING FROM A PROPER OBSERVANCE OF IT.
- VI. ANSWERS TO POPULAR OBJECTIONS.

Pursuing this order and arrangement of our subject, we shall endeavor to show,

- I. THAT FEET WASHING IS A POSITIVE AND STANDING ORDINANCE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The term ordinance means, 1, a law, statute or precept; and, 2, an institution of any kind, whether human or divine, and whether of a civil, literary, moral or religious character. (Lev. 18: 3, 4; Rom. 13: 2; 1 Pet. 2: 13; Heb. 9: 1.) A religious ordinance is a divine service or duty, ordained and enjoined upon man by the

authority of God. There are two kinds of religious ordinances—moral and positive. A moral ordinance is a divine service founded on natural law, and growing out of the nature and fitness of things; as prayer, the Sabbath, &c. A positive ordinance is a christian duty enjoined by a positive law, and which alone must be our rule of action. Of this latter class is the ordinance of feet washing. This institution is founded on the example and precept of Jesus Christ, the great Head of the Church. Every religious service which claims to be a divine institution, must be supported by a divine precept or example, or both. That which cannot claim either one or the other, can be no religious ordinance. Hence we plant our first argument in favor of feet washing upon positive law. We take the ground that the law of the ordinance of feet washing is as plain and positive as either the law of the ordinance of baptism or the Lord's supper.

The first part of our text contains the law on this subject, in the following strong and emphatic language: "Ye call me Master and Lord, and ye say well, for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet."—Now, where is there a more explicit law for the ordinance of baptism or the Lord's supper? Suppose that Christ had said to His disciples at some given time after His baptism, "If I, your Lord and Master, went out to John, and was baptized by him in the river Jordan, ye also ought to go out to him and be baptized by him in Jordan:" would not every one have understood it as a positive and imperative command, that they should do as He had done? Most certainly. They could

not have understood Him to mean anything else. And suppose He had said further, "For I have given you an example, that you should do as I have done:" would they not have felt themselves doubly bound, by precept and example, to go to John and be baptized by him in the river Jordan? And then suppose that He had said still further, (as He did say,) "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature..... teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you:" would they not have felt bound to command others to believe and be baptized, in like manner as He had commanded them? Most unquestionably. Precisely thus stands the case with regard to the ordinance of feet washing. Christ, it is said, in the foregoing context, "riseth from supper, and laid aside His garments; and took a towel and girded himself. After that, He poureth water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded. Then cometh He to Simon Peter; and Peter saith to Him, Lord, dost Thou wash my feet? Jesus answered and said unto Him, What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter. Peter saith to Him, Thou shalt never wash my feet. Jesus answered him, If I wash thee not thou hast no part with me. Simon Peter saith to Him, Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head. Jesus saith to him, He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit; and ye are clean, but not all. For He knew who should betray Him; therefore said He, Ye are not all clean. So after He had washed their feet, and had taken His garments, and was set down again, He said to them, Know ye what I have done to you?"

Here is a plain law of a positive ordinance. And that there might be no mistake, He said, "Know ye what I have done to you?" That is, Do you comprehend my meaning and intention in this ceremony, which I have just performed? This question plainly shows that feet washing was no common custom, or act of hospitality, as some say; for if it was, why should he ask such a question? and why should he tell Peter, "What I do, thou knowest not now?" And why should Peter object to have his feet washed, saying, "Thou shalt never wash my feet? And moreover, why were they all silent, waiting for the Master's explanation? Surely, all this shows clearly that His disciples did not comprehend His design, but were waiting for His interpretation of it. And when He gave them His explanation of the matter, what was it? Did He spiritualize it, and say to them, What I did to you is not intended for a standing ordinance in my Church. I do not wish you literally to wash one another's feet, as I have washed yours. My object simply is to teach you a moral lesson: which is, not to strive with each other as to who shall be greatest in my kingdom; but to be humble, condescending, loving and kind toward each other, as I am toward you.

Now, if He intended it as such, would He not have said so? But did He so interpret it? No, not at all. What, then, did He say? How then did He explain the ceremony? Why, He gave them positive precept and example, as we have heard, for doing to one another precisely what He had done to them. And as He had literally washed their feet, so literally were they to wash one another's feet. If this was not His meaning, then His explanation, to say the least of it, was calcu-

lated to deceive and mislead them. What! tell them to do as He had done, and yet mean something else—and not tell them what that something else was! Surely such duplicity cannot be charged upon a Teacher come from God. Although His enemies charged Him with being a deceiver, yet like other charges preferred against Him, they could not prove one of them. Hence we say, Christ meant just what He said, and said just what He meant. If so, who can deny feet washing to be an ordinance of the New Testament, seeing that it is founded upon precept, example and promise? What more can any New Testament ordinance have? What more and better authority can any man ask in support of a religious ordinance? Neither baptism nor the Lord's supper have any more in their favor. Why, then, make a difference? Why admit baptism and the Lord's supper to be divine ordinances, and deny feet washing, when the authority for the latter is equal to the former? We can see no good reason for thus making this difference. Therefore, we hold and teach feet washing to be a New Testament ordinance, founded on the highest and best authority. If we are wrong in this opinion, Christ himself has led us into error. If, on the other hand, those are wrong who reject and neglect this duty, they will be found inexcusable, seeing the law and example of Christ on this subject are exceedingly plain and unequivocal.

In addition to the foregoing facts and arguments, let it be remembered, that Christ in his commission to his disciples, said to them, "Go teach all nations....teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Now, as He did command them to wash



one another's feet, as He had washed theirs, consequently they were bound, by virtue of their commission, to teach others in like manner to wash one another's feet. That they did so may be inferred from the fact that it was the character of a widow indeed, and that a widow could not be taken into the number of the beneficiaries of the church, except she had washed the saints' feet. —(1 Tim. 5: 10.) How would widows have known feet washing to be a duty, if the apostles did not teach it? These considerations fully establish our first proposition, that feet washing is an ordinance of the New Testament.

We shall now proceed to show,

## II. THE PROPER TIME AND MANNER OF OBSERVING IT.

As to the time and place of the institution of this ordinance, and the proper order it should take, there exists a diversity of opinions. Some are of opinion that it was instituted at Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper, two days before the feast of the passover. (See Matt. 26: 2--6; Mark 14: 1--3.) The passages upon which this opinion is based, are the following: "Now before the feast of the passover, when Jesus knew that his hour was come."—(John 13: 9.) "Some of them thought, because Judas had the bag, that Jesus had said to him, Buy those things we have need of against the feast; or, that he should give something for the poor." —(ver. 29.) These texts, at first sight, seem to make the above opinion quite plausible. But when we consider, that the term "passover" is, strictly speaking, applicable only to the meal of the paschal lamb, ap-

pointed to be eaten on the evening of the fourteenth day of the first month, after which, on the fifteenth day, commenced the feast of unleavened bread, which is called the passover, and which lasted for seven days,—(See Ex. 12: 21; Lev. 23: 5, 6,)—we may readily perceive how to overcome this plausible interpretation of the aforesaid passages, and how to find a truer and better construction of their meaning.

The phrase, “Now before the feast of the passover,” may refer to some point of time on the fourteenth day, just before the killing and eating of the paschal lamb. For then “His hour was come.” That is, the ever-memorable time and season, when Jesus “must suffer,” and when “all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses and in the prophets and in the Psalms, concerning Him.” That was emphatically the hour of hours—when Jesus was betrayed, condemned and crucified. That also was emphatically the most eventful hour in the history of the Saviour’s life, and in the history of the world. “When, therefore, He knew that His hour was come, that He should depart out of this world to the Father, having loved His own who were in the world,” He gave them another proof “that He loved them to the end,” by instituting the ordinances of feet washing and the Lord’s supper.—Hence in the evening of the same day, when the passover was prepared and made ready, Jesus came and sat down with the twelve apostles, and said to them, “With desire have I desired to eat this passover with you, before I suffer.” “But behold the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table.” “And they began to enquire among themselves who it was that

should do this thing.” “Jesus answered, He it is, to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it. And when He had dipped the sop, He gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon.” Then Jesus said, “That thou doest, do quickly.” “Now, some of them thought because Judas had the bag, that Jesus had said to him, Buy those things we have need of against the feast, or, that he should give something to the poor.” Judas, then, “having received the sop, went immediately out, and it was night.”

The phrase in this passage, “Buy those things we have need of against the feast,” may refer to the seven days’ feast of unleavened bread, which was to follow the passover supper. Peter and John had prepared all things necessary for that meal; but there were no provisions made, that we know of, for the balance of the feast. Hence it was natural for some to suppose that Jesus meant that Judas should provide those things.

With this view of the subject, it is evident to our mind that there is no proof in the texts above quoted, nor any where else, that the ordinance of feet washing was instituted at Bethany, two days before the feast of the passover. Judas about that time went and communed with the chief priests and captains how he might betray Christ to them. And it is said “they were glad, and covenanted to give him money.”—(Luke 22:3—5.) Here then, before the feast of unleavened bread, the bargain was made to betray Him to them. See Matt. 26: 14, 15, 16; Luke 22: 8, 14; 10: 11. But this contract between Judas and the chief priests, was not executed until the night of the first day of the feast of unleavened bread. At the time of the eating of the paschal sup-

per, Judas was present and received the sop, by which he was designated as the traitor. And immediately after he had received the sop, he went out to execute his bargain. Whereupon, "Jesus said, Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in Him."

All thus far is plain and easy. Christ, and the twelve apostles with Him, come to Jerusalem, to keep the pass-over with each other for the last time. And when assembled in the room prepared for them, and whilst they are sitting at the table eating, "Jesus riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments, and took a towel and girded himself. After that, He poureth water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded."—(See John 13: 4, 5.) It was there and then also, "that He took bread and gave thanks, and broke it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body, which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also, the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament of my blood which is shed for you."—(Luke 22: 19, 20.)

The only question which now remains to be settled, with regard to the time and order of these ordinances is, Whether the ordinance of feet washing was instituted before or after the institution of the Lord's supper? Both sides of this question have their advocates. Those who place it after the Lord's supper, found their opinion upon John 13: 2, where it is said, "And supper being ended," &c. Here two questions arise, 1, What supper is referred to? and 2, Is the phrase correctly translated?

1. What supper is referred to? If the Lord's supper is meant, and the clause is to be taken as it stands in

the common version, then of course feet washing must succeed the Lord's supper. But this is not contended for. If the paschal supper is meant, then the phrase cannot be correctly translated. For it is evident that the passover supper was not ended at the time Jesus arose and washed the disciples' feet. (See John 13: 12, 18, 21, 26; Matt. 26: 21.) Neither was it ended at the time He instituted the Lord's Supper.—(Matt. 26: 26; Mark 14: 22.) If then, both feet washing and the Lord's supper were appointed during the eating of the passover supper, then the passage in question must be susceptible of another and better translation. And if so,

2. How ought the passage to be rendered? We say it ought to be translated, "*supper being come,*" or *having arrived*. The ablest and best critics among the learned approve of this rendering. In this sense this term is often used in other places, as in chapter 21: 4, where it is said, "*The morning being now come,*" and in Acts 12: 18, "*Day being come.*" If the text in John is thus rendered, all difficulty is removed, and the sense is made easy and natural. Dr. Adam Clarke, in his commentary on this text, says, "'Supper being ended'—rather, while supper was *preparing*." Others say, that we are to understand it to mean, "*supper being finished,*" or, *made ready*; and that Christ and His disciples having just taken their seats, but not yet commenced eating, Christ arose from a prepared table, &c.

Hence, therefore, upon a fair and critical construction of language, and a correct and rational interpretation of all the facts and circumstances connected with the account of these institutions, we arrive at the following conclusions, viz :

\* That the ordinance of feet washing was instituted at the beginning of the passover supper; and the Lord's supper at or about the close of it. Now, if both ordinances were instituted on one and the same night, and at the time of the eating of the passover supper, we further conclude that both ought to be observed together, publicly, in the order they were appointed; that is, feet washing first, and then the Lord's supper. The practice of separating these ordinances, and observing them at different times, or making one a mere act of civility, and observing it privately, as some do, has no warrant in the Scriptures. Christ ordained both at one time, in the night in which He was betrayed; and one just as publicly as the other. What, therefore, God has appointed and joined together, man has no right to set aside or separate.

The next and only remaining point which claims our attention, under this head, is, the manner in which this ordinance ought to be observed. On this subject, we shall find little or no difficulty. There is but one right way of doing it; and that is the way and manner in which Christ did it. It is said, "He laid aside His garments, [that is, His *pallium*, or outer, loose upper clothes,] and took a towel [or apron] and girded him-

---

\* THE order of the transactions on that memorable night, seems to have been as follows,

1. The sitting down at the table and commencing supper.
2. The washing of the disciples' feet.
3. The pointing out of the traitor.
4. The foretelling of Peter's denial.
5. The institution of the Lord's supper.
6. Christ's discourse, prayer, and the singing of a hymn.

self." After that, in the next place, "He took and poured water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel, wherewith He was girded." With this plain example before us, we cannot fail to perceive at once how to perform this sacred duty toward each other. In the text, also, it is said, "I have given you an example, that you should do as I have done to you." If then, we are to do as Christ did, we must take a towel, and a basin of water, and wash each other's feet, and wipe them dry with the towel, after the example He has given us.

With this sacred service the ministers and people of the Church of God usually combine the "kiss of charity;" not because the law of the ordinance requires it, but because such a salutation is repeatedly required and enjoined upon christians; and we think there is no occasion more suitable and befitting for the fulfilment of this duty, than when we are engaged in an ordinance which represents love and union. If some brethren prefer saluting one another upon meeting and parting, be it so; we have no objection. But we think it is both lawful and expedient also to salute one another at the time of the washing of the saints' feet; and therefore we do it.

We shall now proceed to consider,

### III. THE OBJECT AND DESIGN OF THIS INSTITUTION.

Christ never did anything, nor enjoined any duty upon his followers, without a wise and good reason.—Accordingly we cannot doubt but that He had very good reasons for instituting this humble ordinance. Among

these, there may be some we know not now, but we shall know hereafter. But there are some reasons we do know, and among these we may reckon the following. Negatively,

1. *Not because it was necessary.* "If the disciples' feet needed washing, they could have done it themselves. A wise man will not do anything that looks odd and unusual, but for good causes." Besides, Christ said to Peter, "Ye are clean." Now if they were all clean, except Judas, they did not need washing, either literal or spiritual. This then was not the reason why He washed their feet.

2. *Not because they desired it.* Peter, it is said, objected to have his feet washed, and said, "Thou shalt never wash my feet." This shows that he did not desire it. Neither did the rest of the disciples.

3. *Not because it was a Jewish custom.* Had it been a common custom, among the Jews, Peter would have known it, and therefore expressed no surprise, as he did, by saying, "Lord, dost thou wash my feet?"

If then, these were not the reasons of this ceremony, what were the reasons?

Christ instituted this ordinance,

1. *To give His disciples an example of His deep humility*, and of His complacent and condescending love to them. Hence He said, "I am among you as he that serveth." And again, "I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you." Copy my example of humility and love. If I, your Lord and Master, have thus humbled myself, and shown my love for you, be ye also humble and subject one toward another, and abound in love towards each other, and thus



fulfil my new commandment. Christ manifested His humility and love to them by washing their feet, as the woman whom Luke speaks of showed her humility and love by washing His feet.—(Luke 7: 44.) These things were of sufficient importance in Christ's eyes, to inculcate by precept and example. But again,

2. *To test the implicit obedience of His disciples*, was doubtless another design or reason of the appointment of this ordinance. Christ told His disciples, "Ye call me Master and Lord, and ye say well, for so I am."—Now, if I am your acknowledged Lord and Master, you are bound by your own consent, in honor and honesty, to observe and do my will. And whether you always know the reasons of my commands or not, it is your duty to yield implicit obedience to all I say, because I am your Lord and Master. This is the true ground of obedience. Some people make a difference between what they call the essentials and non-essentials of religion. The essentials they are willing to obey, but the non-essentials they set aside. They seem to obey Christ, not because He is their Lord and Master, and because it is right; but merely to escape punishment and get to heaven. This we hold to be a selfish principle. If a man obeys Christ just so far as he thinks it necessary to secure heaven, he will quite likely miss heaven. For although God has graciously promised heaven as the reward of righteousness, yet He requires man to obey Him, not for the sake of heaven, but from a principle of love. "If ye love me," says Christ, "keep my commandments." To test this principle was one of the objects contemplated in the appointment of this ordinance. Another main design was,

3. *To symbolize or represent the two cardinal graces of the christian character—humility and love—and thereby keep His people in constant remembrance of their great and indispensable importance, to their acceptance with Him.* If Christ, the first pattern of moral excellence, was meek and lowly, so also must His people be. And if they are not Christ-like in the spirit of their minds, they cannot be His disciples. “For if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of His.” Be ye clothed with humility, for “God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble.” “Humble yourselves therefore, under the mighty hand of God, that He may exalt you in due time.”—(1 Pet. 5: 5, 6.) Now this prominent trait in the christian character is symbolized in the ordinance of feet washing. Christ here speaks by His example to the eye, and through the eye to the hearts of the people; teaching them, not to strive with each other as to who shall be greatest, but who can best learn of Him to be humble, and to esteem others better than themselves. This is one of the doctrines taught and represented by this humble and instructive ordinance.

Another equally important lesson designed to be taught by this institution, is brotherly love. Love is the essence of pure religion. Without charity, or love, we are nothing in God’s account, but a sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. Hence, Christ said to His disciples, as we read in the latter part of the chapter before us, “A new commandment give I to you, That ye love one another as I have loved you. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.”—(ver. 34, 35.)

Observe here, 1, the standard of love for each other: "As I have loved you." He loved them with a sincere, impartial, fervent, complacent and constant love; so likewise are they to love one another. Observe, 2, the obligation imposed: "A new commandment I give to you, That ye love one another." The old commandment was, "Love your neighbors as yourselves." But the new commandment is, "Love one another as I have loved you." Observe, 3, the evidence of discipleship: "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples." From this we clearly see that love is the principal thing in religion.

Now, the design of the Saviour, in the ordinance of feet washing, was to represent and impress the great importance of humility and love, upon the minds of His people. He knew that the days of darkness and spiritual declension would come, in which formality, fashion and pride would in a great measure supplant heartfelt and spiritual religion; and therefore He designed to establish another *test* ordinance, by which the pure and faithful might try the strength of their graces, and be known to one another and to all men.

Where there is no humility and love in the heart, there can be no true religion; and where there is no true religion, there can be no true Church. But where God has a Church, it will be characterized by humility and charity. And where these christian graces exist, there is a willingness, yea, an anxiety to know and do the will of Christ. It is His law, not the practice of the Church and the custom of ancestors, that governs the true christian in his faith and practice. The man who is clothed with humility, and has the love of

God shed abroad in the heart, and who is not beguiled by sectarianism, is always ready and willing to walk in all the commandments and ordinances of God, as did Zacharias and Elizabeth. For the same reasons that such a man will observe one commandment and one ordinance, he will keep them all. Hence Christ said, "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me." To love and to walk humbly with God, is the chief duty of man. Now, as we have said before, to symbolize and represent humility and love, the chief graces of the christian, and thereby impress their importance more deeply upon the minds of the people, was no doubt one of the chief objects had in view by the appointment of the ordinance of feet washing. The humility and love of Christ, and the importance of these amiable moral traits in the character of the christian, are facts and requisitions ever to be remembered; and the ordinance under consideration is the appointed means of remembering them. It is a memento of Christ's love for us and our love for Him.

4. *To erect and teach us the true standard of happiness.* "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." If you know me to be your Lord and Master, and if you know that "the servant is not greater than his Lord," then you must know also that you ought not to be proud and assuming, but to learn of me to be humble and condescending, and never think it below you to do that, however disagreeable it may seem to flesh and blood, which you have seen me do. "I have given you an example, that you should do as I have done to you." If, moreover, you know that I have condescended and continued to abound in services of love to you, then

you likewise ought to condescend to each other in love and good works, and symbolize these duties, by washing one another's feet.

True happiness lies not in the knowledge of these things, but in the doing of them. "Happy are ye, if ye do them." Most people think, Happy are they that *rise and rule*. But Christ says, Happy are they that *stoop and obey*. Here then, is the true standard of happiness. Many people hope and pray to be sanctified and made happy outside of the commandments and ordinances of God; forgetting that real sanctification and true happiness are attainable only through the obedience of the truth. He that doeth Christ's will, shall know of the doctrine. And happy are you if you know and believe and do His commandments and ordinances. This is the right way to present, future and eternal happiness.

The next thing in order which claims our attention, in the discussion of this subject is,

#### IV. THE OBLIGATIONS INCUMBENT UPON ALL CHRISTIANS TO PERFORM THIS HUMBLE AND SACRED SERVICE.

These obligations are imposed upon christians,

1. *By the command of Christ.* He, as our Lawgiver, has a right to command and to ordain such ordinances as He sees fit and proper. And whatever commands He gives and whatever ordinances He appoints, christians are bound to observe and do. This of course will be admitted on all hands. Then the first question on the subject is, Has Christ commanded feet washing?—We assert He has. He says in the words of our text,

“YE OUGHT TO WASH ONE ANOTHER’S FEET.” Here is a command, or at least what is equivalent to a command. The word *ought* in the original is *opheilo*, and this verb is sometimes translated *must*, *should*, *oweth*, *is indebted*, *are bound*, *behooved*, &c. (See 1 Cor. 5 : 10 ; 9 : 10 ; Phil. 18 ; Luke 16 : 5, 7 ; 11 : 4 ; 2 Thess. 1 : 3 ; 2 : 13 ; Heb. 2 : 17. Hence the force of the term in this place is *to owe*, *to be bound*, *to be under obligation*. It may, therefore, be taken in an imperative sense ; as in Luke 24 : 26 ; Acts 5 : 29. In both these passages, the word “ought” is translated in German “must.” With this rendering, the text will read, “If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also *must* wash one another’s feet.” From this, then, we see that the word is of binding force and imposes duty. This also is clearly shown by the following texts: Matt. 23 : 23 ; Luke 18 : 1 ; Heb. 2 : 1 ; Eph. 5 : 28 ; 1 John 2 : 6. And then again, Christ says, “I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done to you.” This text, in connection with the foregoing texts, carries with it all the authority and force of an obligation to observe this ordinance, arising, first, from the command of Christ, and,

2. *From the example of Christ.* “I have given you an example.” What is an example? The word is used to denote *a precedent for our admonition or imitation*. In 1 Cor. 18 : 11, it is used in the former sense, but in our text it is used in the latter. Here the Saviour becomes a precedent or pattern for our imitation, or in other words, a model for us to copy after. An example is always given to be followed. This is a mode by which Christ sought to instruct His disciples in the

ways of christian duty. This mode He adopted in the ordinance of baptism and in the ordinance of feet washing.

Examples have a peculiar power above naked precepts. This will appear quite evident when we consider,

1. That examples clearly express to us the nature of our christian virtues and duties in their subjects and sensible effects. General precepts form abstract ideas of virtue and duty; but in examples, virtues and duties are made visible in all their circumstances.

2. Examples assure us that certain virtues are attainable, and given duties possible. But precepts simply instruct us as to what are christian virtues and duties, without any assurance of their attainability.

3. Examples, by a secret and lively incentive, urge to imitation. We feel encouraged by the visible practice of exemplars to the performance of duty, because the duty is made more perceptible to our minds, and more easily imitable by us.

Hence, we say again, that examples have a peculiar power and force, as a means of instruction, above mere naked precepts. For this reason, the Saviour employed the power of His example, with the authority of His precept, in the education of His disciples, and especially in the institution of His standing and commemorative ordinances. Hereby He made His precept more intelligible and honorable. Christ is a Commander, like Gideon, who said to his soldiers, "Look on me and do likewise." (Judg. 7: 17.) Also like Abimelech, who said, "What ye have seen me do, make haste and do as I have done."—(Judg. 9: 48.) And like Cæsar, who called his soldiers, not soldiers, but "fellow soldiers,"

and whose usual word was, not "go," but "come." What, therefore, Christ has done, christians should not disdain to do; seeing He has given them an example that they should follow His steps.

Here then, from the two-fold consideration drawn from the precept and example of Christ, we might rest the argument, in proof of the moral and unalterable obligations imposed upon all christians, to observe the ordinance under consideration. And we might the more readily do so for the reason that no one can or ought to ask more in support of any religious duty than precept and example. But we shall proceed to argue the duty,

3. *From the promise of Christ.* He said to His disciples, at the close of the solemn service, "If ye know these things,"—that is, if you know that you ought to obey my precept and follow my example, which I have given you, then happy are you, and happy shall you be, "if you observe and do the things I have taught you." True happiness is a concomitant, and result of a faithful performance of duty, and not of the knowledge of it. Knowledge without grace puffeth up, but submission and condescending love edify and make happy. Hence, christians are bound to obey Christ in all things, whatever He has commanded them, that they may enjoy His favor, and receive the promise of eternal inheritance. But we argue the obligations to observe this ordinance from,

4. *The practice of the early christians.* That the ordinance of washing each other's feet was kept by the early christians, we learn from Paul's letter to Timothy, (1 Tim. 5: 10,) and from Church history.

We gather it, in the first place, from what Paul says



to Timothy about the beneficiary widow. One of the conditions upon which she was to receive the assistance of the church was that "she have washed the saints' feet."—(1 Tim. 5: 10.) Observe here, 1, Whose feet she was required to have washed, and 2, How she was required to wash them.

1. Whose feet was she required to have washed?—Not sinners' feet, but "the saints' feet." This shows that it was not a "good work" or an act of hospitality only, as some say, but an ordinance of God. If not an ordinance, why is this distinction made between saints' feet and the feet of others? No good reason, we think, can be given, except that the ordinances were appointed for the saints, and none other. If believers only have a right to baptism, then saints only have a right to feet washing and the Lord's supper.

2. How was she to have washed the saints' feet?—Not figuratively or spiritually, but literally. Where is the proof of this? In the context. If the washing of the saints' feet is to be taken spiritually, then must the bringing up of children, lodging of strangers, &c., be taken spiritually also. But if the bringing up of children, lodging of strangers, relieving the afflicted, &c., are to be taken literally, then also must the washing of the saints' feet be understood literally.

Now, if the washing of the saint's feet literally was a necessary qualification to entitle that widow to the alms of the church, then the apostles must have taught the doctrine of feet washing: otherwise how could that widow, or any others, have known it to be their duty? But again,

We prove the same thing from the *early history of the*

*Church.* The testimony of authentic history may always be taken as good evidence, when it stands uncontradicted. And as it stands thus in this instance, we offer in proof the following brief extracts :

In Godfried Arnold's celebrated history of the primitive christians, book 3, chap 2, we find the following: "Among the services or duties which were observed by the first christians, that of feet washing was included. In this service the Lord Jesus led the way, or went before; and after He had done it to His disciples, He said to them, 'If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet: for I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you.'"

Calmet says that "on Good Friday the Syrians celebrate the festival of washing feet. The Greeks perform the sacred *niptere*, or holy washing, and in the Latin church this ceremony is practised. The bishops, abbots and princes, in many places, practise it in person."

We read in a valuable work, entitled the "History of all Religions," page 214, that "the Moravians separated themselves from the Anabaptists, in the sixteenth century, and observed many of the original acts of the apostles, such as washing each other's feet, after the manner of a sect which arose in the second century, called Apostolicals, because they observed the acts of the apostles."

"\* \* For the observation of Augustine, that some churches in his time rejected the custom of washing the saints' feet as a solemn imitation of Christ, lest the ceremony might be supposed to have any reference to baptizing, implies that there was no other kind of wash-

ing then practised which bore any resemblance to baptism.”—(Calvin’s Institutes, vol. 3, p. 210.)

“The *pedilavium* practised in early times, was actually considered by some, in the beginning of the fourth century, as a proper substitute for baptism; on which account washing of the feet by the bishops was forbidden by the Council of Eliberis.”—(Beth’s Pædo-Bapt. Exam. p. 95.)

Again, we learn from the Martyr’s Mirror, page 320, that in a very ancient Waldensic Confession of Faith, feet washing is classed among the regular ordinances of Christ. Page 12 reads as follows, “We confess that feet washing is an ordinance of Christ, which He himself administered to His disciples, and recommended by example to the practice of believers.”

Ambrose of Milan, in the fourth century, took it so, and practised it in the church of Milan.

Anstın says, “Those christians who do it not with their hands, yet he hoped did it with their hearts in humility, had much better do it with their hands also.”

#### V. THE BENEFITS ACCRUING FROM A PROPER OBSERVANCE OF IT.

The means and ordinances of religion were all ordered for the benefit of man; and therefore all of them are more or less beneficial when observed and made use of. The standing ordinances are peculiarly beneficial to christians, when rightly observed. The ordinance of feet washing has a special promise annexed to it.—“If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.” Hence, therefore,

1. *Christians are benefitted by a proper observance of this ordinance, because it commemorates the humility and*

*love of Christ.* We have already shown that this was one of the ends for which it was instituted. As a memorial, therefore, of the Saviour's deep humility and condescending love, it cannot fail to be useful to His humble and cross-bearing followers. This sacred ordinance, so eminently calculated to bring the power and force of Christ's example in respect to these attributes, into a lively and faithful remembrance, cannot fail to excite admiration, and inspire resolution to imitation. And here lies the first benefit accruing to the faithful observers of this ceremony. But christians are benefitted, because,

2. *It represents and impresses their minds with the great importance of humility and love in the formation of their own christian character.* If it is a benefit to have the mind impressed so as to feel the necessity and importance of these cardinal graces, much greater must be the benefits when christians come into actual possession of these virtues, and feel that they are clothed with humility, and have fervent charity among themselves.—Humility and love are the christian's chief ornament and glory, and make him like a city set upon a hill, that cannot be hid ; or like a candle upon a lamp-stand, to give light to all in the house. Hence these graces make the christian twice blessed ; they bless him that gives and him that takes. And to symbolize them by an ordinance, and thus give them perpetual prominence and importance in the eyes of the church and of the world, was a wise and merciful arrangement on the part of the great Head of the Church. Furthermore, christians are benefitted by the observance of this ordinance,

3. *Because thereby they are reminded of the fact, that*

*the vows of God are upon them to be faithful.* As Christ was faithful over His own house, and came not to be ministered to, but to minister, so christians are likewise called to be faithful in their heavenly Father's house, by discharging every duty they owe to God, to one another, and to their fellow men around them. Especially are they taught by this ordinance to dwell together in unity, to live in peace, and serve one another in love; putting away from among them all bitterness and wrath and anger and clamor and evil speaking, with all malice; and be kind to one another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake has forgiven them. (Eph. 4: 31, 32.) Such lessons, so impressively taught, cannot but be beneficial. But finally, christians are benefitted by this ordinance,

4. *Because they humble themselves and obey Christ.*—We have shown before that it was intended to be a test of their implicit obedience, and that those who implicitly obey Christ, have the promise of happiness. “If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.”—He that humbleth himself, shall be exalted. Wisdom's ways are ways of pleasantness and all her paths are peace.

The duty of man to secure his own happiness, is one of the first laws of his nature. It is one of the first and most natural principles in the breast of mankind, and which neither ought nor can be laid aside by any man. Hence, how widely soever men may differ in other things, yet in this it is manifest they all agree, that to search for happiness is alike the duty and interest of all mankind. Learned and ignorant, wise men and foolish, the righteous and wicked, do all agree on this

point; the only difference between them lies in determining wherein their true happiness consists, and by what methods it may best be attained. It is also the uniform judgment and testimony of the wise and good in all ages that real and abiding happiness is nowhere to be found but in the favor of God and the practice of pure religion. Herein, moreover, there can be no controversy, that the favor and blessing of God, and the consolations of true religion, are pivoted on faith and obedience. He that believeth on Christ with a heart to righteousness, and who abides in His word, has the promise of acceptance and happiness. But he that knows his Master's will, and doeth it not, to him it is sin, and he shall be beaten with many stripes. Hence, the gospel shuts up every man to the necessity of faith and obedience. And hence, also, to the observance of the ordinance of feet washing, as part of His revealed will. Intelligent and conscientious christians, who read and hear and know this ordinance to be their duty, cannot remain disobedient with impunity. And those who know these things and do them, cannot but be happy.

In conclusion, we proceed to consider,

## VI. ANSWERS TO POPULAR OBJECTIONS, URGED AGAINST THE ORDINANCE OF FEET WASHING.

The usual and most popular objections to this ordinance, which have come under our observation, are the following,

1: *That feet washing was an ancient Jewish custom, and that Christ did it in conformity to that custom.* This objection we hold to be entirely unsusceptible of proof.

It cannot be shown that feet washing was a prevailing custom among the Jews, and that Christ observed it as such. We admit that the washing of feet, like the washing of the face and hands, was in vogue among them; but then, the custom was for each one to wash his own hands, face and feet, as it is among us. To prove this fact, we here quote and present the following texts. The first passage in point on record we find in Gen. 18: 4. "Let a little water be fetched, and wash your feet." Thus said Abraham to the angels, or three men, who paid him a visit. In a similar way, Lot addressed the two angels who came to Sodom in the evening, saying, "Behold now, my lords, turn in, I pray you, into your servant's house, and tarry all night, and wash your feet."—(ch. 19: 2.) Again, when Eliezer, Abraham's servant, who was sent out to seek a wife for Isaac, his master's son, came to the house of Bethuel, in the city of Nahor, in Mesopotamia, Laban, Rebecca's brother, said to him, "Come in, thou blessed of the Lord; and he gave him straw and provender for his camels, and water to wash his feet and the men's feet that were with him."—(ch. 24: 31, 32.) We are also told that when Joseph's brethren went down to Egypt the second time to buy corn, and were invited to dine with Joseph, the ruler of his house "gave them water, and they washed their feet."—(ch. 43: 24.)

Again, we read in the book of Judges, that a certain Levite went to Bethlehem to bring home his wife, and that on his return he was hospitably entertained by an old citizen of Gibeah, who brought him into his house, "and they washed their feet, and did eat and drink." (Judg. 19: 21.) We are also informed in Luke 7: 44,

that Jesus said to Simon, the Pharisee, with whom He dined, and where a woman washed and anointed His feet, "I entered thy house, thou gavest me no water for my feet."

Now these passages fully refute the objection as alleged above, and show conclusively that the custom was for guests to wash their own feet, and not the customary office performed by servants or by the host.

The text 1 Sam. 25: 41, and which is the principal one relied upon, does by no means prove it: but shows that the act that Abigail proposed doing was an unusual one, and even that act was never performed.

But admitting it was a custom in ancient times, to wash feet at public entertainments, or when lodging strangers, would that excuse us from doing what Christ taught and did? Had He not a right to make an ordinance out of a custom? If therefore He has ordained the washing of feet as an ordinance in His Church, (for this is the point on which the subject turns,) then we are bound to do it, and we have no right to creep out from its obligations, because it was an ancient custom.

Besides, the Saviour's declaration, "What I do, thou knowest not now," and Peter's surprise and objection, as found in the context, furnish additional proof of the same fact. So that in reality, there is nothing valid in this objection. But it is objected,

2. *That feet washing, as performed by Christ, was a mere act of civility*, and that He did it on the ground of necessity and utility. This objection is brought against this ordinance by Elder John L. Dagg, D.D, President of the Mercer University, Ga., who in an article on the washing of the saints' feet, published in the Southern



Baptist, says, "The apostles had bathed themselves before sitting down to the paschal supper, and therefore did not *need* any washing, except the feet. On this *need*, small as it may appear, the Saviour placed the fitness and propriety of the act which He performed.—He therefore who washes the feet of a saint when those feet do not need washing, is as if he gave a cup of cold water to a disciple who is not thirsty." J. C. Goulden says, "It was a *real* service. The disciples feet needed washing, and therefore Christ did it for them."

Now, we ask, where is the proof for all these assertions? In the absence of proof, assertion says nothing *pro* or *con* on any subject, no matter who makes it. If therefore Dr. Dagg, or any body else, can prove the assertion, that "the apostles had just bathed before supper, and therefore did not need washing, except the feet," let him tell us where and what that proof is.—And if on this "need" the Saviour placed the fitness and propriety of the act which He performed, when He washed the disciples' feet, let him also inform us where the evidence of that opinion is to be found. Then perhaps we will concur with him in the opinion, "that to wash a saint's feet when they do not need it, is as useless as to offer water to one who is not thirsty." But until this proof is furnished, we shall continue to deny the truth of his assertions, and the validity of this objection. Besides, if this objection is true, then it may be alleged that Christ gave the disciples the Lord's supper also on the same ground, i. e., because they were hungry and thirsty, And hence, to give saints bread and wine when they are neither hungry nor thirsty, is as useless as winter clothes in midsummer.

But neither the one nor the other is true. Again, it is objected that the service of feet washing as performed by Christ, was not intended to be a standing formal ordinance in the Church;

3. *Because it does not, like baptism and the Lord's supper, typify Christ, or because it is not a sacramental ordinance.* This objection is founded in error. It is not true that feet washing does not typify Christ, like baptism and the Lord's supper. All persons can see this, who understand its design: What does baptism represent? It represents and shows forth the burial and resurrection of Christ. What does feet washing represent? It represents and shows forth the humility and love of Christ. What does the Lord's supper represent? It represents and shows forth the sufferings and death of Christ. Hence we plainly perceive that one ordinance typifies or represents Christ as much as another. They are all monumental, if not sacramental ordinances.—Feet washing is as much a memorial of the humility and love of Christ, as baptism is of the burial and resurrection of Christ, or as the Lord's supper is of the sufferings and death of Christ. This objection is also invalid and futile. It is further objected that feet washing is no Church ordinance,

4. *Because its chief design was to enforce a certain class of moral duties, and therefore must be taken figuratively, and not literally.* This objection is partly true, and partly not true. It is true that the Saviour did design to teach his disciples a moral lesson, and enforce the observance of a certain class of moral duties. The duties He designed to teach, inculcate and enforce, are humility, kindness and love. But these duties He intended

to teach and enforce by giving them a visible, memorial and symbolical ordinance, which would impress and keep them before their minds from year to year, and from age to age. This was its chief design, and so far the objection is true.

But it is not true that this service is "no standing ordinance in the Church, and that it must be taken spiritually, and not literally." Now, we say feet washing is a church ordinance. We have proved this fact, beyond the possibility of contradiction, under the first head of our discourse. There also, the proof will be found, that this ceremony is to be taken *literally*, and not spiritually, as Jesus very clearly explained to them, as soon as He resumed His seat at the table. (v. 13—15. It is still further objected,

5. *That we have no evidence* that the apostles and first christians practised feet washing as a divine ordinance. In answer to this objection, we say,

1. It is not necessary to the validity of a religious rite or duty, that we should have the example of the apostles and primitive christians. The example and command of Christ are all-sufficient for this purpose.

Hence, the command of Christ given to His apostles, to baptize "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," is deemed quite sufficient to warrant us in the use of that form, although we have no evidence on record that the apostles and first ministers ever used it.

Again, why is the Lord's prayer in such general use, in the absence of all proof that it was used by the primitive christians?

Now, if all parties are willing to use the form of bap-

tism, as given by Mathew, and the Lord's prayer, as given by Christ, without evidence of its use by the primitive church, why should they not be willing also to practise feet washing, without proof that the apostles and early christians observed it?

2. But then, we say, it is not true that we have no proof of this rite being in practice among the first christians. The case of the widow mentioned in 1 Tim. 5: 10, as we have shown before, is proof positive that there was such a practice in the church at Ephesus; and if in one apostolic church, then doubtless in the rest also. This ordinance is also objected to,

6. *Because it has a formalizing tendency.* This is one of Rev. J. C. Goulden's objections. He says, "Whenever we adhere to ceremonies, merely as such, losing sight of their end or spirit, we will always attach to them more importance than they deserve; and hence such things exert a very pernicious influence upon the real interests of religion, leading, as they do, to the substitution of the form for the power of godliness."—There is a good deal of truth in these remarks. But then, are they not just as applicable to other ceremonies—such as baby sprinkling, confirmation, love-feasts, &c., as well as feet washing? Are there no formalizing tendencies in those ceremonies? If so, why not object to them also, on the same ground? Yea, more, why not object to them, because they are without a divine warrant? They are not founded upon precept, example and promise, as is the ordinance of feet washing.—Yet, against these human ceremonies, there are no objections filed—no apprehensions felt that some persons might attach more importance to them than they de-

serve, or that they might exert a pernicious influence upon the interests of religion. Such an objection as this, comes with an ill grace from the "church of the catechism," where adherence to ceremonies has both a formalizing and Romanizing tendency. Again, this ordinance is objected to,

7. *Because no church, it is said, receives feet washing as a sacramental ordinance.* If it be true that no church receives feet washing as a *sacramental*—i. e. an *oath-bound* ordinance, there are nevertheless many churches which always have, and which we trust always will receive and observe it as a divinely instituted and symbolizing ordinance. From its first institution down to this period, it has been regarded as a religious duty by the humble and faithful followers of Christ, in different countries, and in various communities. All this is a plain matter of history, which needs but to be mentioned, to convince the intelligent and well informed. Who does not know that feet washing is practised in our country by different denominations; such as the Mennonites, Moravians, Free Will Baptists, Christians, Disciples, United Brethren, River Brethren, and others, as well as the Church of God? Hence, therefore, this objection is the offspring of ignorance. But again, this ordinance is still further objected to,

8. *Because it took place under the law*, and has therefore passed away, like the passover, John's baptism, and the tradition of the elders.

As Christ is our passover, we need no Jewish passover, and as we have the institution of Christian baptism, we have no need of John's baptism. And as to the tradition of the elders, Christ positively repudiated

them, whereas feet washing He has expressly commanded to be observed.

But does not this objection lie with equal force against baptism and the Lord's supper? If one was instituted and practised under the law, then were the rest also; and by the same rule of logic, all must pass away.—However, the objection is founded upon false premises, and by consequence the conclusion is false also. Lastly, feet washing is objected to,

9. *Because it is not essential.* Men, it is asserted, may go to heaven without it. Thousands, it is said, have lived and died happy, and gone to heaven, who never practised feet washing as a religious ordinance.—Therefore it is not essential. Now this may all be true, and yet those who neglect it, on the ground of non-essentiality, may be excluded from that blissful abode.—And why? Because man is responsible for what he has, and not for what he has not. God may wink at men's ignorance, because they have no means to be informed; but whether He will excuse those who willfully shut their eyes, and love darkness rather than light, is a grave and serious question.

We might with the same propriety assert, that there are thousands of Quakers in heaven, yea, and thousands who were not Quakers, who never observed any memorial and symbolizing ordinance. But would this be a lawful excuse for us, or for others of the same opinion, to neglect what we know to be a standing, formal and symbolizing ordinance of the Church? No, verily not.

The main question therefore on every religious subject, with the real christian, is, or at least ought to be, *What is the will of God?* not, *What is essential?* what

may I not do and yet go to heaven? Christians don't want to go to heaven by way of *disobedience*, but by the way of *obedience*. They obey God, not for the sake of getting to heaven, but rather from a principle of love, and because it is right, and their duty to do so. These are the true motives to obedience. And hence, the questions, What is essential? What is non-essential? weigh but little with the christian. All he wants to know is, What is my duty, What does God say? If He has made this or that my duty, either by precept or example, that is enough for me. This is the language and governing consideration of the christian. And no wonder it is so, for it is written, "Not every one that saith to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father, who is in heaven."—(Matt. 7 : 21.) If then, feet washing is an ordinance of the New Testament, it is a part of the will of God, and if a part of the will of our Father in heaven, it must be observed. This is the main question. The whole matter turns upon this point.

Here then we close our discourse. We have fairly and fully investigated and discussed the subject under consideration. We have shown: 1. That feet washing is a memorial ordinance of the New Testament. 2. The proper time and manner of observing it. 3. The object and design of the institution. 4. The obligations resting upon all christians to perform this service. 5. The benefits arising from a proper observance of it; and, 6. We have answered the popular objections against it.

Nothing more therefore remains for us to do, save the giving of a brief word of exhortation.

1. Let us say to our brethren in the ministry, Preach

the Word. Keep back no part of the counsel of God. But go, stand up, and speak to the people *all the words* of this life. If feet washing is an ordinance of God, then preach it and practise it, regardless of the smiles or frowns of the world. Remember that the vows of God are upon you, that you are bound to teach the observance of all things whatever Christ has commanded you, and that no one can neglect to do so with impunity.

2. To the membership of all the churches, we say, "Hear ye, and understand what the will of the Lord is." To this end, "search the Scriptures." These are and must be the christian's sole and infallible rule of faith and practice. If you will walk in Christ's ordinances, and keep His commandments, you will have a right to the tree of life, and you shall enter in through the gates into the city. But if you know His will, and do it not, you shall be beaten with many stripes. "For Moses truly said to the fathers, A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up to you of your brethren, like to me; Him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever He shall say to you. And it shall come to pass, that every soul that will not hear that Prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people."—(Acts 2: 22, 23.)



## THE LORD'S SUPPER.

---

TEXT.—“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 had 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 cup 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.—Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.” 1 Cor. 11: 23—29.

---

THE account of the Lord's supper, as contained in this text, was given to the apostle Paul by special revelation. His apostleship, and the whole gospel which he preached, he received, he says, not of man, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. Precisely in the same way also, he received the law of the ordinance of the Lord's supper, as contained in the words of our text. “I received,” says he, “from the Lord that which I delivered to you ; That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread,” &c. Here we have plainly brought to view in a few words, 1. The Author of

this institution—the Lord Jesus. 2. The time of its appointment—the night in which he was betrayed; and, 3. The elements of the institution itself—bread and wine.

Three out of the four evangelists, viz: Matthew, Mark and Luke, record substantially, the same history of this ordinance, which we find in the text. The principal difference in these general accounts of the Lord's supper is, that Paul's account is more explicit and complete than any of the rest. For this reason, we have taken his account of the ordinance as the foundation of our discourse upon this subject. And, in order to give the subject (as we have the two preceding ones) a full and ample illustration, in all its bearings, we propose to consider,

- I. THE IMPORT AND NATURE OF THE ORDINANCE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.
- II. THE LEADING DESIGN AND PURPOSES OF ITS INSTITUTION.
- III. THE QUALIFICATIONS NECESSARY FOR A WORTHY OBSERVANCE OF IT.
- IV. THE RIGHT AND DUTY OF CHRISTIANS TO PARTAKE OF THIS HOLY ORDINANCE.
- V. THE BENEFITS RESULTING FROM A WORTHY CELEBRATION THEREOF. And,
- VI. THE TERRIBLE GUILT AND CONDEMNATION OF THOSE WHO PROFANE THIS SACRED INSTITUTION.

According to this order and arrangement, we shall briefly explain,

## I. THE IMPORT AND NATURE OF THE ORDINANCE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

Here two leading ideas will claim our attention, viz :

1. *The import or meaning of the Lord's supper.*

2. *Its true and proper nature.*

1. *What is the import or meaning of the Lord's supper* ; It does not mean,

1. A sacrament ; that is, an oath of allegiance. This term ought to be rejected, because it is unscriptural, and because it involves the idea of swearing to the Lord. The Romans made their soldiers take an oath of fidelity to their generals. This military oath was called *sacramentum*. Christians, unlike the Roman soldiers, are voluntary, not oath-bound, soldiers. It is not,

2. A sacrifice ; that is, no oblation of Christ's body and blood, as a renewed sacrifice for sin. There is nothing in this ordinance like a sacrificial service—a visible altar, with an oblation of sacrifice. Such a service is inconsistent with the declared end and design of the institution, and contrary to the *oneness* of Christ's sacrifice.—(Heb. 7: 27; 10: 10—12.) It is not,

3. A eucharist ; that is, a giving of thanks. This, also, is a misnomer. But,

4. By the Lord's supper is meant a symbolical and perpetual ordinance of the christian religion, wherein, by eating bread and drinking wine, we show forth and commemorate the sufferings and death of Christ. It is called the Lord's supper, because it was instituted and administered at supper time in the night in which He was betrayed, and about the close of the passover supper. Supper was a chief meal among the ancients.—(1 Cor. 11: 20, 28.) It is also called the Lord's table,

(1 Cor. 10: 21,) the communion, (ch. 10: 16,) and the breaking of bread, (Acts 2: 42.) The next point to be considered, is,

*The nature of this ordinance.* The matter, or outward elements to be used in this ordinance, are bread and wine; and which are symbols of the body and blood of Christ. The first element and memorial in this institution is bread. The text says, "The Lord Jesus took bread, and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, 'Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you,' &c.

1. Bread, then, is one of the external elements to be used in this ordinance. But is it material what kind of bread is used—whether it be leavened or unleavened bread? Our Saviour no doubt used unleavened bread, as no other was in use at the passover feasts. But the disciples in Troas, and those at other places, doubtless used leavened bread, which was used for the ordinary purposes of life. Hence the kind of bread to be used, is immaterial to the validity of the ordinance. Again,

2. Wine is another outward element appointed to be used in this ordinance. But is it material what kind of wine is used? Must it be red or white, mixed or unmixed, fermented or unfermented wine? Red wine, or "the pure blood of the grape," as it is called, (Deut. 32: 14,) was the wine chiefly used in Palestine. But as it is not specified what kind of wine our Saviour and His apostles used, therefore it seems to be a matter of indifference what kind of wine is made use of. It is, however, absolutely necessary to the validity of this holy ordinance that both bread and wine, the divinely appointed elements, be given to every communicant.

The eating of bread and drinking of wine Christ has connected, and therefore they ought never to be separated. The papists and others, who withhold the cup, and administer round wafers only in this ordinance, do greatly err.

The bread and wine in the Lord's supper are not *changed* into the real body and blood of Christ, as some teach. Neither are the real materials of His body and blood incorporated with, in, and under the bread and wine in this ordinance, as others hold and teach.—There is no doctrine of *transubstantiation*, nor of *consubstantiation* taught by Christ and His apostles.\*

The words, *This is my body*, and, *This is my blood*, are to be understood in a figurative and not in a literal sense. To understand them literally is contrary to reason, and is contradicted by the evidence of our senses. It is also contrary to the nature of Christ's body, and contrary to the nature and design of the ordinance.—Bread and wine, the elements in this institution, are only emblems and memorials of the broken body and shed blood of Christ.

The verbs *is*, *are*, *to be*, among the Jews, were used to mean, *signify* or *represent*. Hence, ears of corn, and kine are said to be years of plenty and famine.—(Gen. 41: 26, 27.) The ten horns in Daniel are said to be

---

\* TRANSUBSTANTIATION—A change of the bread and wine in the Lord's supper, into the real material body and blood of Christ. This tenet is held by the Roman Catholics.

CONSUBSTANTIATION—A *union* of the real body and blood of Christ with the elements of the supper: so that both substances are blended together, and compose a compound substance. This was the doctrine of Luther and his followers. Both dogmas are unscriptural.

ten kings.—(Dan. 7: 24.) The good seed are said to be the children of the kingdom.—(Matt. 13: 38.)—Christ also is said to be a Vine, and His disciples to be the branches.—(John 15: 1.) The seven stars and the seven candlesticks are said to be the seven angels and the seven churches.—(Rev 1: 20.) From these considerations it is evident that the aforesaid phrases are to be taken in a figurative sense and not in a literal. Analogy is a correct law of interpretation.

The consecration, or setting apart of the elements of bread and wine, by solemn and appropriate prayer, before they are distributed, is altogether proper and scriptural. The Lord Jesus, it is said, took bread and blessed it, that is, consecrated it. In other words, He set it apart from a common to a sacred use, by a suitable and solemn prayer. His example in this consecrating act may rightfully be followed by all His ministers. But then, let it be remembered, that the consecrating service does not change the elements, as some teach, but simply devotes, or appropriates them to their intended use.

The properly authorized administrators of the Lord's supper are the regularly accredited ministers of the gospel, assisted by other officials in the Church. To administer the word and ordinances of religion, is the principal work of the christian ministry.

The proper time of celebrating this ordinance, is in the evening, it being the regular and suitable time for supper, and the time of its institution. The morning is no suitable time for a supper. In the afternoon, also, the time of the offering of the evening sacrifice, Christ our Passover was slain for us.

The frequency of observing the Lord's supper, or how often it ought to be kept, cannot be determined from the Scriptures. Some advocate weekly, some monthly, some quarterly, and some yearly celebrations of it.—Judging from the nature and design of the ordinance, and from the expression, “As oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup,” which by a metonymy, is put for the wine, we may justly conclude that it ought to be kept quarterly at least, if not oftener.

As to the posture in which this ordinance should be observed—whether in a kneeling, standing or sitting posture—ministers and churches differ in their opinions. In our judgment, the sitting table posture is the most befitting, was the most in vogue among the first christians, and is decidedly the most scriptural.

We shall now proceed to consider,

## II. THE LEADING DESIGN AND PURPOSES OF ITS INSTITUTION.

One obvious and chief end and design of the Lord's supper, is,

1. *To commemorate the sufferings and death of Christ for the redemption of the world.* There is no doctrine of the Bible of such momentous and vital interest to the world as the doctrine of the atonement through the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ. And yet, such is the imbecility and imperfection of man, in his best estate, that he needs a remembrancer, a memorial, a symbolical ordinance to keep him in remembrance of the atoning sacrifice of his Lord and Saviour.

In the appointment of the Lord's supper, the Saviour acted upon the principle of human friendship. When

kind and affectionate friends are about to part, not knowing when or where they shall meet again, they are wont to give each other mementos or keepsakes, to keep them in remembrance of each other. On the same principle, the Saviour ordained the ordinance of the breaking of bread. When He was on the eve of leaving His disciples, whom He loved, and when, like the king in the parable, He was about to go into a far off country, to get to himself a kingdom, and after that to return to them again; He took bread and wine, and gave them to His disciples, saying, "Eat this bread and drink this wine in remembrance of me."

Here then, we have the design of this ordinance expressly stated by the Saviour himself. It was instituted for a memorial, a standing monument of His sufferings and death. The bread in this supper represents His body, and the wine His blood. The breaking of the bread signifies the crucifixion of His body, and the pouring out of the wine, the shedding of His blood.—And having thus loved us and given himself for us, and become a propitiation for our sins, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savor; He would not allow His ministers and people to forget Him, but would have His Church in all time to remember Him, who first remembered them and bought them with His own blood. In order the more effectually to accomplish this end, He appointed the Lord's supper as a standing and commemorative ordinance in His Church, and gave the commandment, "This do, in remembrance of me."

Another object and design of this ordinance is,

2. *To show forth the Saviour's death.* The doctrine of the New Testament is, that Christ died for our sins,



according to the Scriptures ; and the bread and wine of the supper are emblems of this event, and designed to keep it in perpetual remembrance. Hence, it is said in the text, "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come." God would have the world, as well as His Church, to know all about the death of His Son. Hence, His ministers are to preach Jesus, and Him crucified ; and His Church are to show forth His death. This they do symbolically, by observing the Lord's supper. In this ordinance, they are to remember Christ, for their own benefit, and to show Him forth, for the benefit of others. To show the Lord's death is to proclaim and represent symbolically, the sufferings and death of Christ, as an atonement for the sins of mankind, and the sure foundation of the Christian's hope of heaven. This preaching and showing of His death is to be kept up and perpetuated in and by His Church down to the end of time, or until He comes again. God has appointed a day, in which Christ will come again in like manner as He went to heaven ; and to them who look for Him will He appear the second time, without sin to salvation. (Heb. 9 : 28.) For He is the Saviour of all them that obey Him. And blessed, it is said, are they that do His commandments, that they may have a right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. But,

3. *The confession of Christ before men* is another end and design of the Lord's supper. Openly, to confess the Saviour before the world, to show our faith in Him, and our love to Him, by keeping His commandments, is made the duty of all His followers. And whoever is ashamed of Him and His word, of him will He be

ashamed before His Father and the holy angels. One way to confess Christ and to show our attachment to Him, is to come out publicly and partake of the Lord's table. This act amounts to a formal avowal of His name and a declaration of our love and obedience to Him. And whoever worthily confesses Him in this and other ordinances and commandments, has the promise of a confession in return before the Father in heaven. Again,

4. *Union and communion with the Church*, is another object contemplated by this ordinance. By celebrating the Lord's supper, we show our identity with the Church, and profess communion and fellowship with the household of faith. It is a visible line of demarkation between the Church and the world. And those who in reality are no more of the world, but who are chosen out of it, and called to be saints, ought to show themselves to be what they really are, "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people, showing forth the praises of Him who has called them out of darkness into His marvellous light."—Faith and love must be evidenced by obedience. It is meet that christians should make a public profession and a formal declaration of their union and communion with the saints. This may be done by eating bread and drinking wine at the Lord's table.

We shall next in order consider,

### III. THE QUALIFICATIONS NECESSARY FOR A WORTHY OBSERVANCE OF IT.

These necessary qualifications are,

1. *A christian state and character.*

2. *A reasonable knowledge of the nature and design of the ordinance.*

3. *A state of peace and reconciliation with the people of God, and,*

4. *A suitable frame of mind.*

1. *A christian state and character* are necessary to qualify a person for admission to the Lord's table.—First, a christian state is necessary. Man by nature is carnal and in a state of enmity against God. And, whilst in that state, he is disqualified for a worthy participation of the Lord's supper.

“No person,” says an English writer, “can at all partake of the Lord's supper worthily, until he has a living union with Christ, and is a part of His mystical body; for then only can nourishment and support be communicated to him. All who are not thus united to Christ, are as branches cut off and withered, and can receive no more benefit by coming to the Lord's table, than a dead body can from meat and drink.”

Secondly, a christian character is necessary. With the immoral and scandalous we are not to eat, that is, at the Lord's table. (1 Cor. 5 : 11.) Neither are we to give that which is holy to the dogs, nor cast our pearls before swine.—(Matt. 7 : 6.)

But when, by the grace of God, sinners are changed, and brought from a state of nature into a state of grace and reconciliation with God; and when they evidence this change by a life of self-denial and humble conformity to the requirements of God, then they may come and eat of this bread, and drink of this cup.—The Lord's supper is a Church ordinance, and he that belongs to the Church, in the true sense of the term, has

a right to this institution. Hence, therefore, "Let a man examine himself, so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup."

Another necessary qualification for the Lord's Supper is,

2. *A reasonable degree of knowledge of the nature and design of the ordinance.* God requires men to act understandingly. They are to walk in the light, and in the right ways of the Lord. Consequently, they must know the way and will of God, in order to walk therein. The ignorant and the unconscious have no claims to this ordinance. They are not fit for it.

In the third century, and for many centuries afterwards, infants were admitted to the communion, on a mistaken sense of John 6:53, 54; and on a like mistaken sense of John 3:5: they were admitted to the ordinance of baptism. But infants are not capable of examining themselves as to their state and character, neither are they able to understand the nature and design of this christian ordinance: and therefore, they cannot have the requisite qualifications for this, or any other church ordinance. Those who commune at the Lord's table, must do it intelligently, or else not at all.

Again; Because; no act of worship is virtuous, or acceptable to God, unless intelligently performed. The act of celebrating the Lord's supper, has no merit, except it is observed as the Lord's supper, and made to signify what was intended by its Author.

3. *Those who commune at the Lord's table, ought to be in a state of peace and reconciliation with their brethren.* The christian's character, duty and legacy is peace.—

He is bound to follow peace, and if possible, to have peace with all men. But especially, must christians strive to have peace among themselves. Union, peace and harmony characterized the apostolic church. The same lovely character ought to adorn every church and family of God, in every age and place. Behold, says David, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.—(Ps. 133 : 1.) And, to keep up, and preserve this good and pleasant state in the church, the Saviour says, in His sermon on the mount ; “If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother has aught 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.”—(Mat. 5 : 23, 24.) The obvious meaning of this passage is, that we cannot acceptably worship God, while we live at variance with our brethren, and therefore, we are bound to follow peace, that is, to strive, or make effort to become reconciled, where there is a breach of peace.

Sometimes, however, we find men and women so crooked, perverse and quarrelsome, that it is not possible to have peace with them. In such cases, we must do our duty, and pursue the course laid down by our Saviour. (Matt. 18 : 15—17.) This being done, we may bring our offering to divine acceptance. Once more,

4. *A suitable frame of mind* is a necessary qualification for a worthy observance of the Lord's supper. God is a Spirit, and all who worship Him acceptably, must do it in spirit and in truth. To worship God in spirit and in truth, is to worship Him according to the requirements of His word, and in a devout and spiritual

state of mind. With such a pious frame of mind, filled with emotions of faith, love and gratitude, should we approach the table of the Lord, and partake of the memorials of the Saviour's dying love.

A suitable state of heart and mind should always characterize the true worshiper. No worship can be pure and acceptable in the sight of God without a proper state of mind. Men may possess all the qualifications we have noticed, that is, they may be christians, intelligent, and have a correct knowledge of the nature and obligations of this sacred rite—and they may be at peace with their brethren and all mankind; and yet, by reason of the hurtful influence of the pride of life, the deceitfulness of riches, and the lust of other things, they may be in such a cold, dark and far-off state of heart and mind, as to be entirely disqualified for a worthy and acceptable participation of the Lord's supper. The heart must be properly fixed, and the mind be brought into a devotional frame, in order to be fully prepared for the celebration of this ordinance. Hence, the apostle says, "Let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."—(1 Cor. 5 : 8.)

We shall now proceed to consider,

#### IV. THE RIGHT AND DUTY OF ALL ACCREDITED CHRISTIANS TO PARTAKE OF THIS HOLY ORDINANCE.

A christian is one who believes the truth, who has experienced the truth, and who obeys the truth as it is in Jesus. An accredited christian is one who is recog-

nized as such by his fellow christians, who is in good standing among them, and has the confidence and esteem of his brethren. All such, we say, have

1. A JUST RIGHT AND CLAIM TO THE LORD'S TABLE. But this right is founded,

1. *Not on baptism.*
2. *Not on feet washing.*
3. *Not on confirmation.*
4. *Not on church membership.*

1. *The right to partake of the Lord's supper is not founded upon baptism.* "Baptism," says Dr. Fuller, "being the divinely appointed mode of entrance into the visible church, we consider the absence of it as a disqualification for all the offices and exercises peculiar to churches. We decline a union with pedit-baptists in the celebration of the Lord's supper, because it is a church ordinance, and to unite with those as church members who in our opinion have not entered the church by the door of Christ's appointing, would be, we conceive, a most unworthy reflection on His wisdom, and disregard of His just authority."

This mode of reasoning is founded upon false premises. Baptism is not the door into the church. Both baptism and the Lord's supper are ordinances of the church; and it is nowhere said that baptism is a prerequisite for the Lord's supper. This dogma is an assumption without proof. Again, the right to the Lord's table does not depend,

2. *Upon the ordinance of feet washing.* The sticklers for the order of church ordinances, contend that both baptism and feet washing must precede the Lord's supper. But where is the law requiring this order? With-

out such a law, there is no authority for this position.

Again, the right of communing at the Lord's table is not founded,

3. *Upon the rite of confirmation.* "Those who are true christians by virtue of baptism are not made perfect christians, except by virtue of the sacrament of confirmation. Confirmation completes what was begun in baptism."—(See Hist. of Denominations, page 138.)—This also is a false dogma. It is an assertion, without the shadow of an argument to prove it. Furthermore, the right to the communion is not founded,

4. *On the grounds of church membership.* Church membership, *per se*, does not guarantee the right to the Lord's supper. Ordinarily, however, accredited membership does give the right. But then, we base the right of breaking bread, more particularly upon *christian character, filiation and heirship*. And,

1. *Upon christian character.* If a man is a christian, he has an undoubted right to the church, and to all the ordinances of the church. If he is not a christian, he has no right to belong to the church, or partake of her ordinances. Again, the right to communion, rests,

2. *Upon sonship and heirship.* If christians, then children, if children, then heirs, and if heirs, then a scriptural right to all the privileges and immunities of the kingdom of God, both in this world and that which is to come. Jerusalem, which above is free, which is the mother of us all. The next thing to be considered, is,

2. THE DUTY AND OBLIGATION RESTING UPON ALL CHRISTIANS TO PARTAKE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER. This duty is not denied, except by the Quakers and a few others.—



But we hold it to be a sacred and solemn duty, resting upon all the people of God. It is an imperative duty.

1. *Because Christ has expressly commanded it.* "This do, in remembrance of me." And again, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup."—(See the text.)

2. *Because it is one way, openly to confess Christ,* which is the duty of all men.

3. *Because it shows the Lord's death.* This, also, is the duty of all to perform.

4. *Because it is a means of doing good.* And he that knows to do good and does it not, to him it is sin.

5. *Because it is a means of grace.* That is, by its use, grace is communicated by Christ, to believers, as the life principle is imparted by the vine to the branches. And,

6. *Because it glorifies God.* To glorify and enjoy God, is the chief end of man.

Upon these reasons and obligations, we need not dilate, it being, generally, an acknowledged duty, incumbent upon christians. We shall therefore, go on to consider,

## V. THE BENEFITS RESULTING FROM A WORTHY PARTICIPATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

There are two extremes into which many christians have fallen, respecting the benefits accruing from a right reception of the Lord's supper, namely: some expect too much; others, not enough. The first error is, that some persons expect too much by attending to the Lord's table. They regard it in the light of a sav-

ing ordinance, and expect, literally, to eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ, and thereby obtain the forgiveness of sins, an ingrafting into Christ, the gift of the Holy Spirit, and a right and fitness for everlasting life. Hence, some people who have lived in the neglect of God and religion, whilst in health, send for some minister of religion when they get sick, and desire to have the Lord's supper administered to them, expecting thereby to obtain a preparation for death and heaven. They regard it as a kind of a passport to heaven, by which they are saved, and without which they are lost. This is a total misapprehension of its nature and design. Such an expectation is groundless and fallacious. It is expecting too much.

But then, on the other hand, many christians err, by not expecting enough at the Lord's table, and thereby lose much of the benefits which might otherwise be obtained. Now, as we must not over-value, so neither must we under-value this holy ordinance, and thereby deprive ourselves of the real and legitimate benefits which may be derived from a devout observance of it.—The right and better way is, not to expect more nor less than what we are justly warranted to look for, and which we may confidently expect, according to the word of God. What then, may we hope for, and what are we warranted to expect by a due and worthy attendance upon the Lord's supper? In other words, what are the real and veritable benefits of the Lord's supper, flowing from a right reception of it? These are,

1. *Communion with Christ.* The Scriptures evidently teach the subsistence of an intimate communion and fellowship between Christ and His people. This near

and intimate communion is compared to that which exists between husband and wife—the body and its members—the vine and its branches.—(Eph. 5: 29, 32; 1 Cor. 12: 12, 27; John 15: 1.)

This union and communion, therefore, is not a vain and imaginary thing, but a real, perceptible and sensible intercourse and fellowship with Christ our living Head. Hence, John says, “Truly our fellowship is with the Father, and His Son Jesus Christ.”

Communion with Christ may be enjoyed in prayer, and in the use of all the means and ordinances of religion; but it is, or may be specially enjoyed at the Lord's table. Hence, therefore, the apostle Paul says, “The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread.”—(1 Cor. 10: 16, 17.) This passage furnishes us with a scriptural guide as to the benefits to be expected at the Lord's table. By communion in this text is meant a participation or enjoyment of the body and blood of Christ. Not indeed literally, but spiritually, by the exercise of faith in the redemption which is in Christ Jesus. It is as Bickersteth says: “When in a journey, on a winter's day, we are favored with a clear sky and a shining sun, we say, ‘we have the sun with us,’ by which we mean the light, warmth and comfort of his beams: so, when the apostle says we have in the Lord's supper ‘the communion of the body and blood of Christ,’ he shows that the benefits of His sacrifice are enjoyed by us.” Not, as we said before, literally, but spiritually. We are not to sup-

pose that Christ is present in any corporeal way, and that communicants really partake of His corporeal body and blood in a literal sense, but rather that He is present with them spiritually, and that they feed on Him by faith in like manner, as they do in other ordinances, when He condescends to hear their prayers, to supply their wants, and to impart to them spiritual nourishment and growth in grace.

The Lord's supper is ordained to be a spiritual feast on Christ's sacrifice; for thus the apostle styles it—"Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us. Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."—(1 Cor. 5 : 7, 8.)

Here then, at this feast, we have a great and distinguished benefit. We eat and drink with our King, in the kingdom of God, and we hear Him saying, "Eat, O friends; drink, yea, drink abundantly, O beloved!"

2. *Communion with saints* is another benefit which we enjoy at the Lord's supper. It is said in the so-called apostles' creed, "I believe in the communion of saints." We also believe in the communion of saints; yea, more, we believe in the union and oneness, as well as the communion of saints. And we believe that nowhere is this union and communion so fitly and appropriately exhibited as in the celebration of the ordinances of feet washing and the Lord's supper. Here, in these ordinances, christians enjoy the peculiar benefit of communing with one another.

Feet washing symbolizes love and union. So likewise

does the breaking of bread, in one respect. "For we being many," says the apostle, "are one bread, and we are all partakers of that one bread." As the body is one, and has many members, and all the members of that one body being many, are one body, so also is Christ. The head of body is Christ, and all His people, are members of that body. Consequently in close intimate communion with each other, and with Christ, the Head of the body. At the Lord's table we enjoy this communion. The church is here seen as a compact body. The symbols of bread and wine, in the supper, strikingly and beautifully illustrate this intimate union and communion of God's people. "As the loaf is formed of many grains of wheat, so the people of Christ, however once distinct from each other, by the cementing bond of the gospel become connected together in the most intimate and close union. As the wine in the cup is formed of the juice of many grapes, which are all blended together, and thus the various juices become mingled and lost in one, so are the once distinct and varied minds and hearts of christians united together in Christ Jesus. They have fellowship one with another."

3. *Growth in grace, and soul-prosperity*, is another benefit we derive from the Lord's supper.

It is not a means for bringing the unconverted into a state of grace and favour with God, but a means of strengthening and promoting those who are in a state of grace. This nourishment and growth in grace, the ordinance under consideration is peculiarly calculated to afford.

This holy service leads us to fix our minds steadily

and deliberately on Jesus Christ, and on His active and passive obedience in a believing and faithful recollection of these gospel facts, the grace and spirit of Christ are often largely given, to strengthen our graces and promote our sanctification. And when this is done, we are, of course, greatly benefitted.

This benefit, may not always be given in a sensible and clearly perceptible manner. God has not bound himself to any particular means, or to bestow His blessings in a given measure, or in any particular way.—Nevertheless, those who wait upon God in the use of His own means and ordinances, shall renew their strength, and find it to be their meat and life to keep His commandments. It may be, that in the supper as in the case of prayer and other means of grace, there may be sometimes a gradual and imperceptible benefit, as in the food we eat, or the medicine we take, or in some other means we use to sustain and promote the health of the body. Yet what God has ordained for our good, cannot fail to accomplish the end.

4. *A pledge and foretaste of future blessedness.* This is another great benefit resulting from a worthy reception of the Lord's supper.

1. It is a pledge of future and eternal blessedness.—The words of the Saviour, in the law of the institution, “Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you,” and again, “This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you,”—clearly imply, that christians, when they receive the sacred emblems of Christ's body and blood, receive also, a pledge and assurance of the favor of Him who addresses them.—Christ here symbolically says to His people, “Because

I live, ye shall live also." And they His people may confidently say, "God has given us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. Therefore being justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him."— And hence, they have a sure pledge of their future and eternal blessedness. But,

2. In this ordinance christians also have a foretaste, as well as a pledge of their heavenly blessedness. It is in the ordinances of God's house, that christians, as a general thing, realize the presence and blessing of God more sensibly than in any other means. It is here the spirit of faith applies the atoning merits of Christ, and fills their souls with joy unspeakable and full of glory. Christ intends His people should be happy, should rejoice evermore, and when they commune at the Lord's table, to come to a feast where gladness is sown for the upright in heart. It is here the Holy Spirit takes of the things of Jesus and shows them to His faithful ones. These animating glimpses and visions of the riches of His grace and glory inspire their souls with transporting faith, hope and charity; so that, in the exercise of these graces, in all their preciousness and vigor, they may realize a glorious anticipation and foretaste of their future and everlasting blessedness. Blessed, thrice blessed are they who eat bread and drink wine with the Lord Jesus Christ in the kingdom of God. We shall now proceed, in the last place to consider,

## VI. THE TERRIBLE GUILT AND CONDEMNATION OF THOSE WHO PROFANE THIS SACRED INSTITUTION.

By profaning this ordinance we mean, divesting it of its sacredness, and putting it to a wrong use. Such

desecration and abuse involves fearful guilt and condemnation. Hence, it is said in the text, "Whoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." And again, "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself." These passages show the terrible guilt and condemnation of those who abuse and pervert this holy institution. Who then may be said to profane this rite, and to eat and drink unworthily? We answer,

1. *Those who commune from sinister and unworthy motives.* In some countries, baptism and the Lord's supper are made conditions of holding civil offices.—And even here, in our country, there are certain offices and positions which cannot be held without being a communicant member of a church. And then again, connection with a church is sometimes popular, and calculated to give a person weight and influence in society; or to procure custom and patronage in certain professions and occupations; or even to build up a lame and broken down character. If therefore, persons identify themselves with the church and become communicant members, with a view to obtain a civil office, or to secure custom and patronage in business, or from any other sordid and sinister motives, they profane the ordinance, and eat and drink unworthily. But,

2. *Those who come to the Lord's table, without discerning the Lord's body.* The text says: "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, not discerning the Lord's body, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself." To discern the Lord's body, is to understand and consider the great design in the Lord's supper—to discriminate



and make a distinction between it and a common meal—and looking through the outward elements in the supper, to Christ's vicarious atonement, relying on it alone for present and future salvation. Some have no capacity, and others are too ignorant and self-righteous, to discern or make a distinction, as to the Lord's body. All persons, therefore, who come in their ignorance and blindness, in a carnal and careless frame of mind, without due reverence, and without looking to, or confiding in the meritorious sacrifice of Jesus Christ, profane this holy rite, and receive it unworthily.

3. *Those who neglect to examine and prepare themselves, before they eat the Lord's supper.* The law of the ordinance requires, expressly, self-examination.—“Let a man, (anthropos, a person,) examine himself, and so let him eat of this bread, and drink of this cup.” But why are candidates for the Lord's supper, to examine themselves?

1. To ascertain whether they are christians. The Lord's supper, as we stated before, is a church ordinance, and therefore is designed for christians, and not for sinners. Communicants must examine themselves,

2. To know whether they understand the nature and design of the Lord's supper. God would have His people to act understandingly. If we are to pray and sing with the understanding, we ought to eat and drink at the Lord's supper with the understanding also. Again, we must examine ourselves,

3. To know whether we are in charity with all men. The scriptures require love and union, and forbid hatred and malice among christians. We must therefore

be found in the exercise of charity and good will towards all men, whether believers or unbelievers:

Now, if persons come to the Lord's table, without self-examination—without knowing, or having any evidence of their being christians—without understanding the meaning and object of this solemn rite, and without peace and charity with their brethren, they are evidently unprepared, and they eat and drink unworthily. Once more,

4. *Those who willfully sin and live in open rebellion against God..* Sin is a transgression of the law. It is two-fold. There are sins of omission, and sins of commission. If men willfully neglect to do what God commands, they are guilty of sins of omission, and if they do what God forbids, they are guilty of sins of commission. If therefore, men willfully allow themselves to live in sin—whether in sins of omission or of commission, and thus openly rebel against God, they are unfit for the Lord's table. And when such are allowed to commune, they profane the holy ordinance, and eat and drink damnation to themselves. That is to say, they fall under condemnation and are liable to be punished. The term "damnation" is not to be taken in its theological or Bible sense, as meaning future and everlasting punishment in hell. Yet those who partake of the Lord's supper unworthily, involve themselves in great guilt and condemnation, because they are guilty "of the body and blood of the Lord." Hence, such daring and presumptuous persons may be visited with the rod of chastisement, and that many of them were punished with sickness and death, in consequence of their repeated profanation of the Lord's supper.

And now, having discussed the propositions prepared, permit us, in conclusion, briefly to review the subject in hand, and then add a brief word of exhortation.

The subject we have discussed is a very important one. Upon it a great deal has been said from the pulpit and through the press. But notwithstanding all this, it is still very imperfectly understood by many—neglected by others, and abused and perverted by not a few. To rescue this holy ordinance from its abuses, to direct the ignorant to a proper understanding of it, and to induce all to prepare for a righteous observance of it, have been the chief objects aimed at by this discourse.

We set out, in the first place, with an explanation of the true meaning and nature of this ordinance. Here we showed what it did not mean, and what it did mean. Also, what the elements are, how and by whom they are to be consecrated and administered; together with the proper time and frequency of administering them, and the posture in which the symbols ought to be received.

We next considered the design of the Lord's supper, viz:

1. To commemorate Christ's sufferings and death.
2. To show forth His death.
3. To confess His name openly before men, and,
4. To declare our union and communion with His Church and people.

Next in order, we pointed out the principal qualifications necessary for a worthy observance of it. To wit,

1. A christian character.
2. A knowledge of its nature and design.
3. A state of peace and harmony with our brethren, and,

4. A suitable frame of mind.

In the fourth place, we endeavored to show the right and duty of all christians to commune at the Lord's table. This point we also treated negatively and positively—showing what are not and what are the true grounds upon which their right and duty are founded.

Under the fifth head of our discourse, we pointed out the benefits of a right reception of the Lord's supper. Namely,

1. Communion with Christ.
2. The communion of saints.
3. Growth in grace and soul prosperity.
4. A pledge and foretaste of future blessedness.

In the sixth and last place, we considered the fearful guilt and condemnation of those, who pervert and profane this holy ordinance, viz :

1. Such as receive it from sinister motives.
2. Such as are unqualified to discern the Lord's body.
3. Such as neglect to examine themselves, and come unprepared. And,
4. Such as are presumptuous sinners, and live in open rebellion against God.

Such persons as these doubtless receive the Lord's supper unworthily, and thereby involve themselves in tremendous guilt and condemnation before God; yea, and sometimes draw down the just judgments and wrath of God upon their guilty souls.

This then, is a synopsis of the order and method in which we treated this subject. We endeavored to cover the whole ground involved in the doctrine of this ordinance; and on that account we were obliged to study brevity in every department of our sermon. Enough,

however, has been said, to illustrate this ordinance in all its essential aspects and bearings.

We shall now, therefore, close this discourse with a brief word of counsel and exhortation. And,

1. *We address those who habitually neglect this sacred ordinance.* The neglect of a positive institution and a positive ordinance to observe it, cannot fail to involve the neglectors in great sin and danger. If the neglect to celebrate the passover was punished with excommunication from God's people, what sorer punishment must await them who neglect the last institution, and the dying command of the Lord Jesus? To forget and neglect the last words of a kind friend is a sure mark of the want of love and respect for that friend. Just so with regard to Christ. Those who live in the willful neglect of His last command, from year to year, cannot but add to the guilt of other transgressions, and expose themselves to condemnation and perdition. And hence, such persons cannot be much less guilty than those who eat and drink unworthily. For if the defective performance of a duty is sinful, the neglect of it altogether cannot be much less so. Some, indeed, think it better to spoil a duty than omit it. From this opinion, however, we dissent. We hold, with Solomon, that it is better not to vow, than to vow and not pay; and with the apostle, that it is better not to eat and drink at the Lord's table, than to eat and drink unworthily. Nevertheless, this thing of living, as most people do, in the known and habitual neglect of religion and religious ordinances, is not, and cannot be excusable, under any circumstances, and on no account whatever. Such a life is sinful, and only sinful, and that continually. "For,"

says Paul, "if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just reward—yea, and if they escaped not who refused him who spoke on earth, much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from Him that speaketh from heaven."—"A Prophet," said Moses, "shall the Lord your God raise up to you of your brethren, like to me. Him shall ye hear in all things whatever He shall say to you.—And it shall come to pass, that every soul which will not hear that Prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people."—(Acts 3: 22, 23.)

Such then is the sinner's deplorable predicament, and such his fearful dilemma, that whether he eats the Lord's supper, or abstains from it, he sins against God. For, although he has no right to commune at the Lord's table, until he is duly prepared for it, yet neither has he a right to live in a state of impenitence and disobedience, and so remain unprepared for it. His business is, to prepare himself for this duty, and for all the duties which God has enjoined upon him; and to observe and do them. This is the sinner's only alternative, by which he can escape from his sad predicament. He is bound to prepare, and go forward in duty. No other course can be pursued with impunity. There is no apology for sin, when it is in our power to avoid it. To cease to do evil and learn to do well—to fear God and keep His commandments, is the duty of all men. But,

2. *We counsel and exhort* those who are sometimes in great perplexity of mind as to what is best for them to do—to receive this holy rite or to abstain from it. The right and duty of receiving the Lord's supper, as we have shown, belongs exclusively to believers who are

begotten of God. Hence, the first thing for each one to do, is to ascertain whether he is a christian. When this question is properly decided, then his perplexity of mind, and his doubts and fears, will soon be dispelled. But how is this question to be settled? How can a man know whether he is a christian? We answer, by prayer and self examination.

1. By prayer. "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not: and it shall be given him."—(Jas.1: 5.)

2. By self examination. Let a man examine himself. Let him scrutinize his state and character. Not only as to his emotions and feelings and frames of mind, but also as to his christian character and manner of life, and as to the general disposition and inclination of his mind. In this way, a man may judge himself, and ascertain his right and privilege to commune with God's people. And though he has not that happy and peaceful state of mind which others enjoy, yet if he has sufficient evidence to know that he is a christian, and that he is at peace with his brethren, then he runs no risk of eating and drinking "unworthily," although he does it amidst many doubts and fears. The sin and condemnation of unworthy communicants need not make him hesitate to perform this duty, if he knows for himself, that he is no longer a stranger and foreigner, but a fellow-citizen with the saints, and of the household of God. This is the main question to be decided. The children of the kingdom, or the members of the household of faith, have an undoubted right to the Lord's table, whether they are rich or poor, young or old, bond or free, Jew or Gentile; and whether their joys and consolations are great or small. But again,

3. *We would earnestly and affectionately counsel and exhort all our brethren in the christian ministry, to keep up a regular system and a uniform practice of administering the Lord's supper, and all other church ordinances, statedly and publicly. If it is right and necessary to keep up public preaching and social prayer meetings, it is also right and proper to keep up stated and regular seasons for administering the standing and symbolical ordinances of God's house. In this, therefore, dear brethren, fail not. Lastly, and,*

4. *We exhort all our christian and faithful brethren in Christ Jesus, to maintain their integrity and righteousness before God, and to walk in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, blameless. Never absent yourselves from the Lord's table, or any other religious ordinance, when it is in your power to attend. The path of duty is the path of safety. Never can you do better, and be more advantageously employed, than in keeping the precepts and statutes and judgments of the Lord. Such as do these things, have the promise of the life that now is, and that which is to come. They are heirs to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away, reserved for them in heaven.—Wherefore, holy brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure; for if ye do these things, you shall never fall; for so an entrance shall be ministered to you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST.*



