

ABOLISHED RITES.



Class BV 180

Book 1 G 7

Copyright N^o 1909

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.

ABOLISHED RITES,

OR

SPIRITUAL, NOT CEREMONIAL
WORSHIP.

BY
A. H. GOTTSCHALL.
11

Eighth Edition.

ADDRESS

THE CHRISTIAN UNION,

250 HUMMEL ST.,

HARRISBURG, PENN'A.

1909.

BV180
G7
1909

COPYRIGHT, 1908,
BY
AMOS H. GOTTSCHALL.

©Cl.A256229

PREFACE.

WE ASK for a careful reading of this little book, and hope that its contents will be prayerfully considered in the light of the New Testament.

Concerning the observance of rites and ceremonies, it may be said: "Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him. * * * Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind."—Rom. 14:3,5. The reader may well say:

"Why, these are the very views entertained by the Quakers." "Yes," we reply, "they are, and in this their doctrine we indorse them. Does not the Christian world in general recognize the Quakers as being a godly and spiritual-minded people?"

If we have not repented of sin, believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, and are not living a holy life, merely observing ordinances or setting them aside is nothing. "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love. For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. And as many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God."—Gal. 5:6;6:15,16.

ABOLISHED RITES has passed through various editions since 1887, and the more we test its teaching by the New Testament, the more are we convinced that

God, who is a Spirit, should be worshiped in spirit and in truth, and not through rites and ceremonies.

In the preparation of this work we have gleaned from a wide field of literature on the subject, manifold authors and works have been quoted, from the Second and Third Centuries on down. In a book of this size quotations so numerous must necessarily be condensed; so from each author or work we have usually inserted briefly, without the use of asterisks where matter has been omitted. Many of the Christians from whom the quotations have been made were non-observers of ordinances, while others, though they may have stood identified with those who observed rites and ceremonies, or may themselves have observed them, still prove by their words that they believed them neither to embody saving merit, nor to be essential to a holy life.

A. H. GOTTSCHALL,

HARRISBURG, PA., Feb. 23, 1909.

ABOLISHED RITES.

“THE law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.”—John 1:17.

If Christ abolished types and shadows, why should we still observe them? If we are *complete in Christ alone by faith*, why should we still cling to fleshy emblems? These are searching questions, which will not be lightly dismissed by the sincere and spiritual-minded believer.

The great Head of the Church said to the woman at the well: “*The true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship Him. God is a Spirit: and they that worship Him MUST WORSHIP HIM IN SPIRIT AND IN TRUTH.*”—John 4:23,24.

Every child of God knows that he received Christ *by faith*, and not in, through, or by any perishable ordinance. Paul most emphatically says: “As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so WALK YE IN HIM.”—Col. 2:6.

It is a mistake to teach that completeness in Christ by faith is not sufficient, but that some rite, ceremony, or type, administered by human hands, is necessary to completeness and obedience.

As well might an artist try to improve on the grandeur of the star-studded canopy of the heavens with his puny brush as a man endeavor to better the finished work of Christ in efforts to make a man more meet for the inheritance of the Saints in light by dipping his body into water, or inviting him to partake of perishable emblems.

When God has finished the work of a soul's salvation, by the mighty agency of His Holy Spirit, through the new birth, and most emphatically teaches in His Word that in the acceptance of His Son as our Saviour, and an implicit soul rest upon the vicarious atonement of Christ, we are *complete*, who shall say we need something that a man can add to make us more complete or acceptable?

Our worship is now "*not of the letter (the law), BUT OF THE SPIRIT: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.*"—2 Cor. 3:6. "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: *for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.*"—1 Cor. 2:14.

There need be no literal, fleshly eating, drinking, and washings, or baptisms, now in the worship of God, but we *should feast upon Christ BY FAITH*. Like the Israelites while in the desert, we should now "all eat the same *spiritual meat*; And . . . drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that *spiritual Rock* that followed them: and that Rock WAS CHRIST."—1 Cor. 10:3,4.

"For the kingdom of God *is not meat and drink: BUT RIGHTEOUSNESS, AND PEACE, AND JOY IN THE HOLY GHOST*. For HE THAT IN THESE THINGS SERVETH CHRIST IS ACCEPTABLE TO GOD."—Rom. 14:17,18.

"It is a good thing that *the heart be established with grace; NOT WITH MEATS, WHICH HAVE NOT PROFITED THEM THAT HAVE BEEN OCCUPIED THEREIN*. We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat *which serve the tabernacle.*"—Heb. 13:9,10.

Many Christians believe that carnal ordinances are obligatory now: many others do not. But if we have the spirit of Christ, we will not ignore and disfellowship those who differ from us in respect to these outward, earthly things.

If we reject a child of God because he does not see as we do, and because he clings to rituals which we

plainly see have been abolished, we are not manifesting the right spirit. On the other hand, if the advocates of ordinances persecute us because we are satisfied with CHRIST ALONE, and reject all fleshly emblems which He abolished, they prove that they are occupied with something besides Christ, that they lack His mind and spirit, and at the same time show that the observance of fleshly ceremonies has not imparted to them the fruits of the Spirit. Every intelligent Bible Christian will acknowledge that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, and that we are saved alone by appropriating to ourselves through faith the redeeming merits of His atonement for us on the cross. Then why should we ignore or denounce one another because we do not see alike in what are, at best, but *non-essentials*, in the great matter of salvation?

It is an evident fact that religious ignorance, hatred, and persecution usually go hand in hand, and nowhere, perhaps, are these traits more prominent than in ordinance advocates. Because Stephen preached down rites and ceremonies, and held up Jesus as being all-sufficient, he was stoned to death; Acts 6:13,14;7:59,60.

The pages of martyrology prove that during the earlier centuries of the Church a countless host of worthies passed up to join the blood-washed throng by way of fire, rack, knife, water, and every invention of cruelty and murder that religious monsters could invent; and for the very reason that they refused to make an idol of bread and wine. Not less than two hundred and eighty people were publicly burned, or otherwise killed, in England, in 1555 and the three years following, principally because they differed with their religious enemies about the bread and wine. And of the thousands of people said to have been killed directly or indirectly by the fearful persecutions of the Catholic Church in various countries, many of these were slaughtered because of their non-conformity in the sacraments, as history amply proves, and as is shown in other parts of this work.

How much in the dark are people who fancy that they must consume a bite of bread and a sip of wine as a means of remembering the Lord, when His very last message to the Church is: "*Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and WILL SUP WITH HIM, AND HE WITH ME.*"—Rev. 3:20.

"Ye are the temple of the living God; *as God hath said, I WILL DWELL IN THEM, AND WALK IN THEM.*"—2 Cor. 6:16. If the Lord, then, on His own assertion, dwells and walks in His children in spirit, how unreasonable it is to say that in order to remember Him we must observe a fleshly eating and drinking!

The Catholic Church maintains that the number of ordinances, or sacraments are seven. When Luther and the other early Reformers left Rome they carried two or three of these ordinances along, and left the rest behind. No man or set of men have all the light and truth, and these early Reformers made a grand stride from the yoke of dead rites and ceremonies in dropping four or five of the husks of Catholicism, especially in that dark day of Romish ignorance and superstition. Is it any wonder that later on other discerning Christians should also drop the other two or three as the Quakers and others have done and still do? Many centuries before either Luther or the Quakers appeared, even from the First or Second Centuries on down, as history shows, God has had a people who, discarding the borrowed rites of Judaism, strove to accept Christ as the end of all types and shadows, and aimed to be satisfied with *the baptism of the Spirit*, and to be fed *by faith* upon Him who is the BREAD OF LIFE and to seek for that worship which is spiritual and not ritualistic.

Some Christians insist that in the act of observing ordinances they show their humility, and thus make a sacrifice. To the honest, devoted soul there is comfort in the thought that duty is being performed, yet their idea of duty may not have truth for its foundation. Others claim to receive a blessing in the observance

of ordinances. This may, in some cases, be true. There is always a comfort and satisfaction in doing what is believed to be right. Loyalty to convictions brings inward composure. But that is no proof against error. Paul lived in good conscience, and thought he was doing God service while cruelly persecuting the Saints. On this point Burgess well says :

“When a man performs that which his judgment calls upon him to do, he finds great serenity of mind. You must never judge of the truth of any way in religion by the comfort and peace of conscience you find therein; for all Turks, Jews and heretics have much quietness of conscience in discharging that traditional religion they are brought up in, and would be much troubled in conscience to deny or apostatize from their way.” “This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? *Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, ARE YE NOW MADE PERFECT BY THE FLESH?*”—Gal. 3:2,3.

“For Thou desirest not sacrifice; else would I give it: Thou delightest not in burnt offering. *The sacrifices of God are* A BROKEN SPIRIT: A BROKEN AND A CONTRITE HEART, O God, Thou wilt not despise.”—Psa. 51:16,17.

“*I am the living bread which came down from Heaven: if any man eat of this bread, HE SHALL LIVE FOREVER.* * * * *It is the Spirit that quickeneth; THE FLESH PROFITETH NOTHING:* the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.”—John 6:51,63.

We have nothing but Christian love for those who conscientiously believe that in the observance of outward rites they are obeying and pleasing God, nor would we for a moment tolerate the idea of anything so unchristian as holding aloof from them because of their doctrine and practice in these things. No; all who know Jesus to the pardoning of their sins are our dear brethren and sisters, irrespective of the observance or non-observance of ordinances.

We can, we trust, worship God in Spirit and in truth by their side, but on the other hand, our freedom in the Spirit must not be fettered by their rituals. Paul, after turning from the rites of the law to the gospel of grace, labored in harmony with some who seemed still to have been of the circumcision; see Col. 4:7-12, but he was not bound by their practice. The poet gives expression to the same sentiments in the old hymn :

“ We'll not bind our brother's conscience,
 This to God alone is free ;
 Nor contend for non-essentials,
 But in Christ united be.”

“ Here's my hand, my heart, and spirit ;
 Now in fellowship I'll give ;
 Now we love and peace inherit,
 Show the world how Christians live.”

The idea that God insists upon a literal water baptism, a literal washing of feet, a literal table, a literal cup, a literal feast of bread and wine, IN A SPIRITUAL DISPENSATION—and that, too, as a means of following, imitating or remembering Him who promises to be ever in and with us *spiritually*—seems absurd to a spiritual-minded man or woman, providing, of course, that light upon these truths has shown into the soul. We receive light upon divine things *only as we want it, ONLY AS WE CAN BEAR IT, ONLY AS WE WILL WALK IN IT.*

It is an undeniable fact that too often as Christians grow formal and loose in soul-life they try to make up for it by zealously observing rituals. But as believers, like Samuel, “*grow before the Lord*” (1 Sam. 2:21), they see the hollowness of clinging to outward ceremonies. They are satisfied with Christ, and having Him, they would not (knowingly) dishonor Him by allowing anything emblematic to take His place. “*Now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held ; that WE SHOULD SERVE IN*

NEWNESS OF SPIRIT, and NOT IN THE OLDNESS OF THE LETTER."—Rom. 7:6.

If people, when being occupied with bread made by the hands of a woman, and wine made by the hands of a man, would, like Peter (after observing a type), "*remember the word of the Lord*" (Acts 11:16), they might more fully grasp the meaning, and more fully enjoy the reality of partaking of the real Lord's Supper which Jesus Himself invites us to in Rev. 3:20, where He says: "*Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, AND HE WITH ME.*"

If we have Christ in spirit, why should we cling to any perishable remembrance of Him? Must we consume *a bite of bread and a sip of wine* as a means of remembering Him whose Word declares that "*Ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.*"—2 Cor. 6:16. If we really have Christ by faith, *who is the end of every-thing typical*, why should we still cling to the shadow?

Right here is where many Christians make a mistake by adhering to that which was of the Mosaic dispensation, and was never intended to be kept up by the Church in the gospel age. In Acts 15, nineteen years after Christ, the Gentiles were received without the law, or rather declared to be exempt from it, as they had never been under Judaism, *but not the Israelites*, for in Acts 21, twenty-seven years after the cross, *the Jewish believers were keeping the law*, and it is only first in Heb. 9:10, thirty-one years after the cross, that the law of types is plainly declared to be abolished.

Some Christians seem slow to understand that the rituals of Moses were still observed by the New Testament Christians for years after Christ, but the New Testament plainly declares the fact. Read the fifteenth and twenty-first chapters of Acts. In Acts 18:21 Paul said: "I must by all means keep this feast that cometh in Jerusalem," and in Acts 20:6, he said: "And we sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened

bread." In Acts 24:18, he says, "Whereupon certain Jews from Asia found me purified in the temple." *So we see that Paul, with others, at this time, was still observing the law.*

"Before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be *justified by faith*. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For ye are all the children of God BY FAITH IN CHRIST JESUS."—Gal. 3:23,24,-25,26.

Our ordinance brethren so often quote Matt. 11:13, (A. D. 31), "All the prophets and the law prophesied until John," and claim that this text virtually declares the abolishment of the Jewish types, but the text makes no such assertion; Jesus, in Matthew 23:2,3 (A. D. 33), moreover says, "The scribes and the Pharisees sit in *Moses' seat*: All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, *that observe and do*." Again, Mark 1:44, "Show thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing those things which *Moses commanded*, for a TESTIMONY UNTO THEM." Here we see that *the Jewish law was still in force after John's appearance*, and JESUS HIMSELF RECOGNIZED IT.

Others say that the observance of Mosaic rituals actually ceased at the cross. Neither is correct, for we find the rites and ceremonies of the law zealously observed by the believing Jews for years after Calvary, as has already been shown. While Christ in very deed did abolish rites and ceremonies at the cross, *the time for their actual cessation was not declared till Heb. 9:10, thirty-one years later.*

"A testament is of force *after men are dead*: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth.—Heb. 9:17. The Christian Church, or dispensation, may, in a sense, be said to have grown out of the Jewish, and the washings, or baptisms, and the Passover Supper of that ceremonial system, seems to have been so implanted into the minds and customs of some,

that they may not always have been fully dropped by all. Indeed in the Second and Third Centuries, as history asserts, there began a lapsing back into old customs, and a trust in ceremonies. This leaning toward Judaism and its ceremonies became more marked later on as Catholicism came to the front, especially from the Third Century on, and by this latter system rites and ceremonies were greatly increased and magnified. Many of the more modern Reformers never fully cut loose from the ceremonies of Judaism and Catholicism, but carried some of them, namely, water baptism and the supper, along out with them.

This backward movement on the part of the Early Church is, as we find, first mentioned in history as appearing in A. D. 140, 150, 175. Neander, the great German ecclesiastical historian says :

“Christianity having sprung to freedom out of the envelope of Judaism, *had stripped off the forms in which it was first concealed.* This evolution belonged more particularly to the Pauline position. The Jewish principles which had been vanquished, pressed in once more from another quarter. Humanity was as yet incapable of maintaining itself *at that lofty position of pure spiritual religion.* The Jewish position descended nearer to the mass. This recasting of the Christian spirit in the Old Testament form did not take place, it is true, everywhere uniformly alike. In general, the more men *fell back from the evangelical to the Jewish point of view,* the more must the original free constitution of the communities, grounded in those original Christian views, become changed. We find Cyprian (A. D. 250) already completely imbued with the notions which sprung out of this confounding together of the different points of view of the Old and New Testaments.”

Seemingly with the adoption of rites and ceremonies from Judaism in the Second Century, the Early Church

rapidly drifted into what later became Catholicism, cropping out more and more from the Third Century forward. The priesthood that came into power evidently seeing that a code of rituals was advantageous in maintaining priestly prestige, rule and power, added ceremonies to their hearts' content, and seem to have convinced their following that it was all of Divine approval. Baptismal regeneration, penance, purgatory, and the whole system of Popish emptiness, followed in course of time.

Later on down the line of time, says D'Aubigne, the French historian, (died 1630): "Indulgences were more or less an extraordinary branch of Roman commerce ; the sacraments were a *staple commodity*. The revenue they produced was of no small account."

Mosheim, the great German ecclesiastical historian (died 1755) says : " It is certain that to religious worship, both public and private, many rites were added, *without necessity*, and to the great offense of sober and good men. The principal cause of this I readily look for in the *perverseness of mankind*, who are more delighted with the pomp and splendor of external forms than with the true devotion of the heart ; and who despise whatever does not gratify their eyes and ears. Also, there is good reason to suppose that the Christian bishops *multiplied sacred rites* for the sake of rendering the *Jews* and the *Pagans* more friendly to them, for both had been accustomed to numerous and splendid ceremonies from their infancy, and had *no doubt that they constituted AN ESSENTIAL PART OF RELIGION*. Hence, when they saw the new religion *TO BE destitute of such ceremonies* they thought it too simple, and therefore despised it."

"The simplicity of the worship which Christians offered to the Deity had given occasion to certain calumnies, spread abroad both by the Jews and Pagan priests. The Christians were pronounced *atheists*, because they were destitute of temples, altars, victims,

priests, and all the pomp in which the vulgar suppose the essence of religion to consist. *To silence this accusation the Christian doctors thought they must introduce SOME EXTERNAL RITES, which would strike the sense of the people*, so that they could maintain that they really had all those things of which Christians are charged with being destitute; though under different forms. Also, it was well known that in the books of the New Testament, *various parts of the Christian religion are expressed by terms borrowed from the Jewish laws*, and are in some measure compared with the Jewish rites."

"In process of time, either from ignorance or motives of policy, *the majority maintained that such phraseology was not figurative*, but accordant with the nature of things. Bishops were called *high priests*, and the presbyters, priests, and deacons, *Levites*. In a *little time*, those to whom these titles were given maintained that they had the *same rank and dignity*, and possessed the same rights and privileges with those *who bore these titles under the Mosaic dispensation*. Also, from the *Greek Mysteries* the Christians were led to claim *similar mysteries*, and they began to apply the terms used in the Pagan mysteries to Christian institutions, *particularly baptism and the Lord's Supper!* They also introduced the other rites designated in those terms, *and a large part of the Christian observances of this (Second) Century had the appearance of the Pagan mysteries!*"

Dr. Robison, the Baptist historian, on this line says: "*Unconnected as baptism may seem to be with all this, it was, however, the chief instrument of acquiring power and producing a revolution in favor of pontifical dominion*. By this the hierarchy was formed, and by this, *and not by argument*, was chiefly supported. Pope Sylvester dedicated the first edifice to the Romanizing (Judaizing) party, November 9. It was named after Solomon's temple, *to distinguish it from idol temples*. Also, for the same reason, a painting or statue of

Jesus was placed there!—probably the true origin of pictures, images, and all ecclesiastical idolatry.”

“A wooden table there was called an altar, and they denominated those who officiated there *Levites*. The same effects which the baptistery had produced at Rome followed in all other cities, as Venice, Naples, Florence, Pisa, Milan, Boulogne, Viterba, Modena, Verona, Ravenna, Aquileia, and many other cities. The priest of the congregation that claimed the baptisteries became a prelate; the other priests in the city his clergy; some of them were called his ‘cardinal’ priests and deacons, chiefly because they assisted him to administer baptism. From these sprang suffragans, prebendaries, *canons!* chapters, conclaves and councils. Cardinals derived their titles from baptismal churches.”

“The city fashion of building baptisteries was, *as all fashions are*, soon imitated by country towns. The bishop of the city baptismal church inspected and regulated the affairs of the town churches, and provided them with teachers and administrators of ordinances, and generally supplied them with oils and ointments from the metropolitan baptistery. The fetching of this chrism at Easter from the city baptistery, *became* in time an evidence to prove the dependence of these baptisteries on that in the city. The bishop who supplied the baptisteries acquired the most parishes. *It was the baptistery, precisely*, and neither the parsonage house nor the church, which constituted the title to the whole. For this reason baptismal churches are called *Titular churches*. *All these baptisteries were dedicated to John the Baptist* (an ante-Christian, Jewish priest) and not to Christ.”

Dr. J. T. Hendricks in his work on baptism says: “The religion of Christ was a religion of principles. The religion of the Fathers, even in the Second Century, became a religion of sacraments or ceremonies, as the Catholic religion now is. The first symptom of decay in religion, at that time, was, as it ever has been,

a revival of the ritual or ceremonial part. Principles and sacraments in religion never can be kept abreast of each other, they will not remain in a state of equipoise, the spiritual part will be thrown back, and retire, and the merest formalities and grossest superstitions will follow. No sooner than Christ had died, even before His immediate disciples died, this leaven of Judaism began to work itself into the Church, and did leaven the whole lump, and continued down to the Reformation."

Some Christians, and many of them well meaning, erroneously teach that Jesus instituted carnal ordinances for His Church to observe during this dispensation; but let us observe what God's Word says, whether it conflicts with the popular belief or not. It is truth that we must deal with, and not what even many good and well-meaning people may think, do, or teach. "*Christ is the end of the law* for righteousness to every one that believeth."—Rom. 10:4.

"Having *abolished* in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments *contained in ordinances*."—Eph. 2:15.

"Which stood *only in meats and drinks, and divers washings* (Greek and German, baptisms), and *carnal ordinances*, imposed on them UNTIL THE TIME OF REFORMATION."—Heb. 9:10.

"*Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances* THAT WAS AGAINST US, WHICH WAS CONTRARY TO US, and *took it out of the way, NAILING IT TO HIS CROSS*."—Col. 2:14.

"Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, WHY, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances, (TOUCH NOT; TASTE NOT; HANDLE NOT; Which are all to perish with the using;) after the commandments and doctrines of men?"—Col. 2:20,21,22.

Dr. E. B. Turner, a Congregational minister, in a discourse entitled "*Forms not Religion*," says:

“ No part of the Mosaic religion was designed to be perpetuated but its principles. Her forms and ceremonies having now become of no importance, have become obsolete. The entire absence of any prescribed forms in the New Testament indicate it. If any particular external modes of exemplifying and perpetuating the doctrines of the Gospel had been designed, would they not have been the subject of express instruction? Of what use are principles, which cannot, through defect of the means of applying them, be made of practical utility? And if any fixed forms were intended to be established, and to be made perpetual in all countries and ages, is it probable that we should be left without any written formularies on the subject? Who will undertake to show that there are any such formularies in the New Testament? Who will say that they are so clearly defined that ‘ he who runneth may read? ’ ”

Jesus says :—“ *A new commandment* I give unto you, That ye love one another ; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. *By this* shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.”—John 13:34,35.

Any one may observe fleshly ordinances, but the new commandment of “ *Love one another,* ” only Christians who have the spirit of Christ can observe. Jesus plainly declared that upon the two commandments, “ Love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. And * * * thy neighbor as thyself, * * * hang all the law and the prophets.”—Matt. 22:37,39,40.

Again in Mark 12:31, concerning these two commandments of love to God and man, it is said, “ *There is none other commandment greater than these.* ”

It is true that many godly men and women believe in these outward things, and observe them in good faith, not realizing that Jesus forever put away typical worship, and that the New Testament declares legal observances blotted out. We are responsible only for

what we see and understand, but when light dawns, then we are responsible for our use of it.

On the other hand, there always was, in all probability, a "little flock" who worshiped God in spirit and in truth, ignoring outward, fleshly ceremonies, and in all likelihood, there will always be "a little flock" of similar heart and mind. But if we have the spirit of Christ, we will not reject those who differ from us upon these non-essentials. It is not observing ordinances, or laying them aside, that makes a Christian, but it is having the new birth—the life of God within the soul.

Chambers' Encyclopædia says: "Some early Christian sects appear to have rejected baptism on grounds somewhat similar to those on which it is rejected by Quakers at the present day, who explain the passages which relate to it symbolically, and insist that a spiritual baptism is the only real baptism of Christians."

Though not a Quaker, or a member of the Society of Friends, we indorse this their doctrine, and certainly love and respect them for the spirit of Christ, the uprightness of life, and the peaceful and benevolent characteristics so universally attributed to them by Christians in general. The first Quakers landed in America, at Boston, July, 1656, and disseminated their views with zeal and success. William Penn, Quaker preacher and author, the founder and first Governor of Pennsylvania, and the City of Philadelphia, might be called the leading representative of the Friends in America in his day.

The Quakers teach salvation to be obtained only through the death and merits of Christ. They accept the Bible as the work of inspiration and rule of faith and life, believing that in this, the new covenant dispensation, the baptism which embodies saving merit is not that of water, but that of the Spirit; and that the true communion is not partaking of bread and wine, but spiritual feasting upon Christ by faith.

The census of 1880 gives the number of Quakers or Friends in the United States as 72,098, and the number of meeting places as 736. A number of these "meeting houses," as the Quakers call their church buildings, are situated in Philadelphia, one of the early cradles of Quakerism in America and perhaps still one of their strongholds in this country. Many Quakers, too, are found in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and in other countries.

John Wesley, in his diary, Aug. 10, 1739, says: "I had the satisfaction of conversing with a Quaker. O, may those in every persuasion, who are of this spirit, increase a thousand-fold." In the same diary he says: "Thursday, Sept. 22, 1743: As we were riding through a village called Stickpath, one stopped me in the street and asked, 'Is not thy name John Wesley?' Immediately two or three more came up and told me I must stop there. I did so, and before we had spoke many words, our souls took acquaintance with each other. I found they were Quakers, but that hurt not me; seeing the love of God was in their hearts." Again Wesley says in his diary, of June 24, 1742: "I rode to Painswick, where in the evening I declared to all those who had been fighting and troubling one another about rites and ceremonies and modes of worship and opinions, '*The kingdom of God IS NOT MEAT AND DRINK, but RIGHTEOUSNESS, AND PEACE AND JOY IN THE HOLY GHOST.*'" Again John Wesley says: "He that truly trusts in Christ cannot fall short of the grace of God, even though he were cut off from every outward ordinance—*though he were shut up in the centre of the earth.* There is no power in means; separate from God it is a dry leaf—a shadow, and in itself a poor, dead, empty thing. My belief is no rule for another. I ask not of him with whom I would unite in love, are you of my church? of my congregation? If thou lovest God and all mankind, I ask no more; give me thine hand. So far as in conscience thou canst (retaining still thine

own opinions) join with me in the work of God, and let us go hand in hand."

Wesley's spirit and attitude towards the Quakers were certainly God-like, for the Scripture plainly declares: "Of a truth I perceive that *God is no respecter of persons*: But in every nation *he that feareth Him, AND WORKETH RIGHTEOUSNESS*, is accepted with him."—Acts 10:34,35. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."—2 Cor. 3:17.

The Society of Friends, or Quakers, arose in England. Concerning these people, ecclesiastical history says:

"They spread very rapidly in Great Britain and Ireland, as well as largely in the American Colonies. Their great apostle and founder, George Fox, was a man of intense earnestness in his investigation of religious truth, willing to go wherever the truth, as he understood it, might lead him, and to bear any reproach that might be laid on him because of his profession. At first the followers of Fox called themselves Seekers, as indicating their desire to discover the truth. The epithet Quakers was early applied to them by enemies as a term of derision and reproach. George Fox was unquestionably a good man, and sincerely aimed at discovering the primitive truths and practices which had been overlaid in the course of centuries. In his own manifold journeyings and preachings through the country he attracted many by his evident sincerity, no less than by his eloquence, and led them to embrace his views."

"In 1647 he began his missionary career, and in eight years afterward ministers of the new society were spreading their doctrine in various parts of Europe. They endured with calm patience most grievous suffering and oppression. As many as thirty-four hundred of these earnest, God-fearing people were confined in noisome prisons, and many of them died as martyrs to their faith."

“Their meetings were broken up, their persons were assaulted, and they were treated with all forms of indignity and contempt. The society spread very rapidly in England, and when William Penn founded the Colony of Pennsylvania, the cause extended under his influence on this Continent. In New England and other sections of the American Colonies, they became numerous. Strange as it seems, even in New England their trials were most severe; a godly woman and three men of culture and earnest piety were actually hanged on Boston Commons for their faith.”

Of course, the Quakers who arose in 1647 were not the first to discard the rites and ceremonies carried over from Judaism, and to advocate the worship of God in spirit and in truth, because history proves that from the early centuries on down there has been a people who maintained the same truth.

The following brief extracts are gleaned from “*Ritualism Dethroned*,” by William B. Orvis, (a college-trained Doctor of Divinity) published in 1875-1880. The work is probably the most able and complete one on the abolishment of rites and ceremonies ever issued. Its ancient and modern testimony as gleaned by its author in a wide field during his researches covering a period of one-third of a century, are very valuable. The work embodies 2 vols. of 754 pages.

The author died some years ago. Whether or not he has a monument of stone we cannot say, but he has left a monument in his work “*Ritualism Dethroned*” which we hope will never be obliterated, and we pray that the precious truths it embodies may ever have adherents. This Baptist Doctor of Divinity says:

“*Ordinances*, by Protestants so called, are simply borrowed Judaisms, undefined as to time and manner in the early Christian Church (being pre-defined only by the law of Moses), contingent as to observance in the Early Church, and received from, and ranked with,

the other ceremonies of the prior dispensation ; and therefore are not *positive institutions*, nor of any binding force in the Christian Church."

"The writer was also a Pharisee of the Pharisees, made under the law of ritualism—a Baptist of the strictest sect and regular order, coming with all the credentials of baptism, and ordination, and theological parchments, and of ritual observances according to the appointed order of sect worshipping—an Hebrew of the Hebrews, touching the ceremonial law. But all these he now counts loss for Christ and truth, and takes the ground that the Christian Dispensation knows *no ordinances, or ritual law.*"

"Christianity is, and must be, in the nature of things, *a spiritual religion.* Its seat and subject is the *inner man!* It is not in the letter, but in the spirit. Nothing outward or extrinsic strictly belongs to it. Its precepts and commands, each and all, inculcate principles, or the spread of principles to the heart-renewal, or spiritual regeneration of man."

"The circumstances of God's people in Palestine once demanded a Ceremonial Law, and that law was instituted, and inhered in a system we now term *Judaism*; but Christianity knows no such ceremonial law, no more than it knows the ceremonies of pagan worship which were cotemporary with Judaism. *Christ*, the Teacher and Redeemer of all, broke down all these ceremonial walls of partition."

"Towering walls of bigotry and sect are built around rituals, called ordinances, and sacraments, like the flaming sword around the tree of life, lest any man come, and eat and live. Ostensibly the wall is built, lest the sacrament be defiled, or its sanctity be trampled on, which mockery of pretense if there be amazement in Heaven, surely all Heaven stands amazed at such exclusion and sacrifice of souls, for whom Christ died, for the sake of saving a dead form—a ritual! which thus proves a curse to all who so idolize it."

"Dost thou think that God has commanded all

Saints to join some church that has a ritualistic door, and to pass through that door? If so, which is the church? Is it the Congregational Church? or the Baptist Church? or the Presbyterian Church? or the Episcopal Church? or the Methodist Church? or which of the forty or fifty extant *orders* of the Protestant Church? or the Greek, the Lutheran, or the Papal Churches? If Paul were to return to earth, which would he decide to be, the *canonical* Church? or Jesus, the Great Head? Perhaps, He would select (elect) *your* church and *your* baptism, and meekly inform all the others that they were not acceptable in His sight. Thinkest thou this, O, vain man and bigot?"

"Christ's baptism of the Spirit is demonstratively purifying and uniting, while ritual baptism and all sacramentarianism is as demonstratively the reverse. Eating Christ's body by faith in Him who is invisible (the Bread from Heaven), demonstratively gives life, while eating sacraments (bread of earthly elements), as demonstratively gives self-complacency, a censorious spirit, and divisive, and a false idea of the work and will of Christ."

"He is a poor student of the New Testament who does not see that therein the whole ritual, or ceremonial law of the Old Testament is set aside as cumbersome, and as a thing of naught to the Christian Church? And if any writer will point to us where a ritual law is re-established in the same Testament, marking its form and outline, to the intent that it may be practically apprehended as *thus far from God and no farther*, and just to what extent (when, where and how) the will of Christ, the Great Head of the *Christian Church*, would have us interested in it, we will meekly and thankfully sit at his feet and learn."

"This talk about *sacraments* has no warrant in the New Testament. Is there any word in the New Testament that answers to the word *sacraments*, or declares who shall administer them? Is not the *idea* wholly Popish and priestly? *Ordinances* are named in the New Testament, but ever as Jewish, and to be

disregarded and renounced. And, when reassumed in after centuries, the appeal is not to Christ's, or apostolic *authority*, but to *tradition*. Of this we have abundant proof. It might be assumed in advance that a new dispensation (for all the world) would not be ritualistic like the old (the Jewish), and that Christ would not give a law to make bigots and sectarists, or to befool the unconverted with a vain hope of a ritual regeneration. Can any one assent to the proposition that the commission to convert the world was given a baptismal sheath? or that Christ's Spirit can be circumscribed by a ritual? There can be no sacrament but spiritually feeding on Christ. No sacred shrines or fonts, or forms—souls sanctified only are sacred. The heavenly life is not run in the narrow mould of a creed, or guarded and guided and bounded by a rite. Christ has not put salvation at the mercy of human frailty and shortsightedness, or in the power of priestly arrogance thus. No man's spiritual good is at the disposal of any administrator of rites."

"Every student of history knows that strifes about who shall administer baptism, how they shall administer baptism, and when they shall administer baptism, and what adjuncts shall attend it, have been rife for 1700 years. He knows that baptism has been administered in sanctuaries and out of sanctuaries; by bishops, priests, and deacons; to persons sick and well, living and dying; infants and adults; by affusion, by immersion, by sprinkling, by putting bodies into water, and applying water to bodies; by trine immersion, and by single immersion; by immersing with the face downward, and immersing with the face upwards; immersing persons naked, and immersing persons clothed; sprinkling with blood, with sand, and with tears; following baptism with chrism, sign of the cross, white robes, confirmation, holy kiss, honey and milk, and other mummeries too numerous to mention; and that in all these ages disputes about all these modes and adjuncts have been rife. Is this ritual then (and the supper, about which as many conceits and as

many disputes have arisen) found woven into Paul's lofty catholic position, to secure the unity and purity of the Church?—to educate and train the Church to that *higher spiritual life* which she could not maintain, without going back to these carnal elements?"

"Where, we again ask, does the New Testament thus teach, or establish and define a law of sacraments? The evidence simply is, that Judaizers have interpolated them, and that the doctrine of baptism as a Christian ordinance, and of baptismal regeneration, was resorted to by the priesthood to gain power—to increase converts to their flocks and creeds—seizing even infants from their birth and before, to write their mark upon them, with most disgusting details of ceremonial adjuncts."

Surely this is a strong, bold master stroke against the observances of all fleshly ordinances, and coming, too, from a classical scholar, a college-bred Baptist Doctor of Divinity, armed with all the credentials of ordination and theological parchments. Under the head of "WATER BAPTISM" and also under the head of "THE LORD'S SUPPER," other extracts from his work, "*Ritualism Dethroned*," are hereinafter inserted with due credit.

Chillingworth says: "If this resting in outward performances was so odious to God under the law, a religion full of shadows and ceremonies, certainly it will be much more odious to do so under the gospel, a religion of much more simplicity, and exacting so much the greater sincerity of the heart, even because it disburdens the outward man of the performance of legal rites and observances."

Swinnock says: "When corn runs into straw and chaff, those that feed on it may well be thin and lean. When religion runs into formalities and ceremonies, her followers can never be thriving spiritually."

Bishop J. H. Vincent says : " There are people who exalt forms and ceremonies in religious worship, forgetting that parrots can talk, Aeolian harps emit sweet sounds, and sparrows chatter."

Preston says : " There are men who cannot see the body for the clothing, the signification of the spirit for the letter, the sword for the sheath, the kernel for the shell. They cannot see Christ but in the outward bark and rind of ritual observances and ceremonies, in the shell of them ; and so they become unprofitable servants."

The three fleshly rites to which many real Christians needlessly cling are, *Feet-Washing*, *Water Baptism*, and *the Supper*. The custom of feet-washing we consider first.

FEET-WASHING.

THAT the custom of feet-washing was a very old one, and in vogue among God's ancient people as an act of necessity as well as kindness and service, seems plain from Scripture. Even if it had been part of the Jewish ceremonial law, it would not be binding upon Christ's Church now, so many centuries after the time of reformation, Heb. 9:10, *but it is nowhere found to be even a rite of the ceremonial law.*

In 1 Sam. 25:41, before Christ 1060 years, we read the following: "And she arose, and bowed herself on her face to the earth, and said, Behold, let thine handmaid be a servant to wash the feet of the servants of my lord." Again: "Let a little water, I pray you, be fetched, and wash your feet."—Gen. 18:4—1898 years before Christ. "*They washed their feet, and did eat and drink,*"—Judges 19:21—1406 years before Christ. "Come in, thou blessed of the Lord; * * * and gave straw and provender for the camels, and *water to wash his feet, and the men's feet that were with him.*"—Gen. 24:31,32—1857 years before Christ. In those days, as now, the inhabitants of the Eastern countries wore sandals, which consist of soles fastened to the under part of the foot by means of cords or straps, and were little or no protection from dust.

Those who make an ordinance of feet-washing refer to 1 Tim. 5:10, where we find this language: "If she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints' feet." *Nothing is said about its being an ordinance binding upon the Church, but the inference seems to be that it was to be done as an act of kindness or service to the Saints, similar to that of the others just above mentioned.*

We never read of Paul or the other apostles keeping up such an ordinance; and if it was to be observed, WOULD THE REST OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BE SILENT CONCERNING IT?

John 13 asserts that Jesus washed the feet of His disciples. That He did this as a reproof for their desire to be great, and to *give them a lesson in humility*, and to teach them to TAKE THE LOW PLACE, and serve one another, certainly seems very plain. Just before this they had been quarreling among themselves as to which should be greatest. Luke 22:24-27, says, "*And there was also a strife among them, WHICH OF THEM SHOULD BE ACCOUNTED THE GREATEST. And He said unto them, The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. But ye shall not be so: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve. For whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? is not he that sitteth at meat? but I am among you as he that serveth.*"

How easy of comprehension are the Saviour's words! By His act of washing their feet, one of the most menial services that could be performed, He desired to show them that their proper attitude one toward the other was that of one who serves—who takes the low place. *The Lord here says nothing concerning feet-washing as an ordinance to be kept up by the Church.*

Instituting ordinances was not Christ's mission on earth, but the abolishing of them was part of His mission. "Having abolished in His flesh the enmity, *even the law of commandments* CONTAINED IN ORDINANCES."—Eph. 2:15.

John 13 says: "He 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 unto 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 unto Him, Thou shalt never wash my feet. Jesus answered him, If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me. Simon Peter saith unto 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 unto them, Know ye what I have done to you? 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. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his Lord; neither he that is sent greater than He that sent him. If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them."—John 13: 4-17.

Carefully examine these scriptures, and see whether Christ is teaching a lesson in humility, giving an example in taking the lowly place, or whether He is instituting a rite, with instructions to call it the ordinance of Feet-Washing. Remember the words of Jesus: "*It is the Spirit that quickeneth; THE FLESH PROFITETH NOTHING: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.*"—John 6:63.

While washing the feet of His disciples literally, Jesus said unto them: "*What I do thou knowest not now; BUT THOU SHALT KNOW HEREAFTER.*" If He only desired to teach them the mere act of literal feet-washing, such an expression was unnecessary, for they well knew that He was then literally washing their feet. But the import of Christ's act and words was much deeper than the mere washing of feet. "*But thou shalt know hereafter.*" And then again: "When He; the Spirit of truth, is come, He will guide you

into all truth.”—John 16:13. How significant this is.

After washing their feet, Jesus said: “*Know ye what I have done to you?*” If He did not mean to teach them something higher than the simple act just performed, would He ask such a question? They well knew that He had literally washed their feet, and if He meant no more than to teach them to literally wash feet, the question would be unnecessary, for they had just seen Him do it. Then He continued by telling them that if He, their Lord, had washed their feet, they should do the same for one another. In other words, they should profit by the symbolic lesson He had just taught them, and be willing to accept the place of lowliness and of serving one another, rather than to quarrel among themselves as to which should be the greatest. 1 John 3:16 says: “We ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.” Do men observe that as an ordinance, *literally?* The Master said, “Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and *take up his cross, and follow me.*”—Mark 8:34. Would any Protestant think of observing this, *literally, by carrying a material cross of wood?* The Catholics do this, but they are not the most spiritual-minded people.

To wash feet as Jesus really meant takes one who has the grace of God in his heart. It takes one who can ask pardon for an injury done; it takes one who is willing to stoop down; it takes one who, when he has wronged another, can confess the error and crave forgiveness.

D. D. Babcock well says: “If when a brother comes to my house through rain and mud, weary, dirty, and footsore, I do not voluntarily clean his boots and clothing; wash his feet, and make him comfortable with my own hands—even if he be poor and despised, outcast and evil-spoken-of—any performance of the *rite* of feet-washing can be nothing more than a hypocritical pretense to love and humility.”

“The letter kills. It is the Spirit that makes alive;

and by the Spirit only can the work of the Living One be performed."

"*Romanism in Europe*," says: "The Levandee, or ceremony of washing the disciples' feet, is still observed by the Pope once a year. It is a mere show or state ceremonial, and a great outrage on sacred things. No one is allowed to attend but the *élite* of Catholic Europe, in court or evening dress. At this splendid piece of pageantry, the pontiff uses a golden ewer and basin; everything is well prepared and highly adorned, perfumes and nosegays of flowers are in profusion, and the whole forms a revolting contrast to a work of humiliation and charity."

With the Bible, which is "a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path," Psa. 119:105, as our guide, we shall now proceed to examine the much-disputed subject of water baptism.

WATER-BAPTISM.

THIS we understand was a rite practiced under the Jewish system, and was typical of Christ's soul-cleansing baptism, which is spiritual. Baptisms, or religious washings by water, was practiced long before Christ came, a fact which the following seems to prove: Levit. 8:5,6 says: "Moses said unto the congregation, This is the thing which the Lord commanded to be done. And Moses brought Aaron and his sons, and washed them with water."

"Take the Levites from among the children of Israel, and cleanse them. And thus shalt thou do unto them, to cleanse them: Sprinkle water of purifying upon them."—Numbers 8:6,7. Again, other instances of legal washings, or baptisms, will be found in Exod. 29:4;30:20,21;40:12,30,32.

The English words *wash* and *baptize* (verbs) are represented in the Greek by the word *baptizo*. So declare Stephen, Pasor, Scapula, Suicer, Heidericus, and many other noted scholars and lexicographers. The Greek word *baptismos* a (noun), according to Deweese, is represented by the English word baptism. The Jewish ceremonies of washings and water purifications were really water baptisms. In the OXFORD BIBLE, under the head of *Jewish Sects, Parties, Etc.*, we find the following: "They were uncircumcised, and were admitted into the Jewish Church *by baptism.*"

This has direct reference to certain proselytes converted to Judaism. In the same Bible, under the head of a *Glossary of Antiquities, Customs, Etc.*, is the following:

"Bathing was a luxury, or rather a necessity, in the hot climate of Egypt, and also in Babylonia; but

among the Hebrews it was practiced mainly as a religious ceremonial, for removal of legal pollution, or *as a symbol of repentance*; from whence arose the ordinance of baptism, which was the prescribed form for the admission of women proselytes into covenant with God in the Jewish Church. Purification was not so much a cleansing of the flesh from the dirt as a ceremonial washing from the typical pollution imparted to a sanctified people by contact with heathens or sinners, or their symbols. So every impure act virtually excluded the participator from the presence of the all-pure God, and needed to be expiated by a fresh *baptism*."

Schaff's Bible Dictionary, under the head of *Baptism*, says: "An ordinance or religious rite, which was in use before Christ's ministry began. Christ Himself did not baptize, and the apostles received instead the baptism of fire and the Holy Ghost. John was a preacher of righteousness; his baptism was significant of the inward cleansing which followed repentance and was introductory to the higher baptism instituted by Christ."

Of course, this higher baptism the above author understands to be the spiritual one. "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but He that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire."—Matt. 3:11.

Clark's Commentary on Matt. 3:15 says: "Christ was circumcised, and observed all the ordinances of the law of Moses, not with a view to His own perfection, but to fulfill the dispensation committed to Him."

Again the same Commentator says: "Our Lord represented the high priest who was initiated into his office by washing, hence, He was baptized to fulfill the law."

The Talmud says : “ Israel does not enter into covenant, but by these three things, circumcision, baptism, and a peace-offering, and all proselytes in like manner. The unborn child is baptized with the baptism of the (pregnant) mother.”

“*Wood on Baptism*,” says : “ The Rabbis unanimously assert that the baptism of proselytes has been practiced by the Jews in all ages, from Moses down to the time they wrote.”

Moses Maimonides, a Jewish Rabbi and writer of the 12th Century, says : “ In all ages when a Gentile is willing to enter into covenant with Israel, and take upon himself the yoke of the law, he must be circumcised and baptized, and bring a sacrifice. He is no proselyte unless he be circumcised and baptized. If he be not baptized he remains a Gentile.”

Prideaux says : “ When any were proselyted to the Jewish religion, they were initiated to it by baptism, sacrifice, and circumcision.”

Dr. Wall, the learned high-churchman, says : “ It is evident that the custom of the Jews before our Saviour’s time (*and as they affirm from the beginning of their law*) was to baptize, as well as circumcise, any proselytes that came over to them from the nations. They reckoned all mankind, besides themselves, to be in an unclean state, and not capable of being entered into the covenant of Israelites without a washing or baptism, to denote their purification from their uncleanness. ‘ And this was the baptizing of them unto Moses.’ ”

Stuart on “*Baptism*,” says : “ In the Mishna, written by Rabbi Judah, A. D. 220, the author says : ‘ As to a proselyte, who becomes a proselyte on the evening of the Passover, the followers of Shammai say, ‘ Let him be baptized, and let him eat the Passover in the evening.’ ”

Dr. K. J. Stewart, a Protestant Episcopal minister of Philadelphia, said: "Has any one authority to require water-baptism of any person outside the Jewish Church and its legal representatives, save only as a mere ticket of admission to some human society? If one claims that he has any authority to require any one to be baptized, let him give us a text; not a text authorizing men to baptize persons desirous of entering a branch of the Jewish Church; but a text requiring a pious 'Friend,' or a Gentile to be baptized, as important to salvation."

"One of the most intelligent societies of Christians utterly repudiates water-baptism as required in Scripture. An Episcopal clergyman has offered a hundred dollars for a text to that import. St. Paul says we are not saved by such ordinances, but only by the blood of Jesus Christ. St. Peter says that the outward washing in baptism does not save us; and finally Abraham received the church covenant, being uncircumcised, that he might be the father of unbaptized people as well as of Jews; see also the case of the first Roman convert, Cornelius, who received the New Testament before baptism."

"These facts do not imply that baptism is not as obligatory as other matters of the Jewish ritual; but he who claims authority to impose water-baptism outside the jurisdiction of the Jewish Church and its branches, has no foundation for such claim in Scripture."

Wilson says: "The Jews baptized the females and children of proselytes, as well as circumcised the males, and all in strict accordance with the principles of membership in the Jewish Church."

Water baptism is first mentioned in the Gospels with John the Baptist—the forerunner of Jesus. John, under the law, said: "*I indeed baptize you with water;* but ONE MIGHTIER THAN I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose: HE SHALL

BAPTIZE YOU WITH THE HOLY GHOST and with fire.”
 —Luke 3:16. “HE MUST INCREASE, *but I must decrease.*”—John 3:30.

Can we mistake this? Here it is plainly stated that *John’s baptism is water*, but CHRIST’S IS OF THE SPIRIT, and that *John’s will decrease*, but CHRIST’S WILL INCREASE. If we have the reality, the Spirit, why go back to the water symbol? “And, being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith He, ye have heard of me. For John truly *baptized with water*; but YE SHALL BE BAPTIZED WITH THE HOLY GHOST not many days hence.”—Acts 1:4,5.

All intelligent Christians agree that there is a spiritual baptism, but some claim that water baptism is also necessary. But we are glad that God’s Word settles the question beyond a doubt, for it plainly says: “*One Lord, ONE FAITH, ONE BAPTISM.*”—Eph. 4:5. “*For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body.*”—I Cor. 12:13. We dare not assume to contradict this, by adding water to the enumeration, if light and truth concerning the abolishment of fleshly ceremonies have illuminated our soul. “Jesus Himself baptized not, but His disciples.”—John 4:2. Some Christians affirm that as Christ was baptized with water, we must likewise observe the rite. But nowhere does He command us in this dispensation of the Spirit, to be baptized in water, or to observe any other carnal ordinance. *He was a Jew, BORN UNDER THE LAW*, and He too fulfilled it, even to circumcision and water baptism.

“And when eight days were accomplished for *the circumcising of the child*, His name was called Jesus. * * * And when the days of *her purification according to the law of Moses* were accomplished, they brought Him to Jerusalem. * * * The parents brought in the child Jesus, to do for Him *after the custom of the law*. They had performed all things ACCORDING TO THE LAW. * * * Now His parents went to Jerusalem every

year at *the feast of the Passover.*”—Luke 2:21,22,27, 39,41.

John did not want to baptize Him, but Jesus said: “Suffer it to be so now: *for thus* it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness.”—Matt. 3:15. To what righteousness does He here refer? Manifestly to the righteousness of the baptismal rite under the Mosaic dispensation. But “when the fullness of the time was come” (Gal. 4:4) *Jesus*, “made under the law,” (Gal. 4:4) FOREVER BANISHED LEGAL CEREMONIES by His work on the cross, and OPENED UP A NEW AND LIVING way. Therefore there can no longer be any merit or righteousness in water baptism to a soul that has the substance to which the water pointed, namely, the *spiritual*.

The Jews did not want to receive Christ, and John tells *why he baptized with water*. It was THAT THE JEWS MIGHT RECOGNIZE THE MESSIAH, because they looked on water baptism as a ceremonial of their law. Now if water baptism was not an ordinance of the Jewish economy, and so recognized by the Israelites, how could the observance of it by Jesus prove to the Jews that He was the looked-for Redeemer? “Now I say that Jesus Christ was *a minister of the circumcision* for the truth of God, *to confirm the promises made unto the fathers.*”—Rom. 15:8.

John says: “I knew him not: *but that He should be MADE MANIFEST TO ISRAEL, therefore am I come baptizing with water.*”—John 1:31. So it is plain beyond dispute, that Christ observed the rite of water baptism because it belonged to the rituals of Israel, because He was an Israelite, and because it behooved Him *to be thus* “MADE MANIFEST TO ISRAEL.”

Those who talk so much about “following Christ down into the water,” should also, in order to be consistent, follow Him in circumcision and in all the other Jewish observances, if there be any merit now in these outward things. Let it be remembered that Jesus, as a Jew, observed the ceremonial law faithfully, and that very law, too, which, as the Messiah,

He forever blotted out when the time came. The literal observance of the fleshly rites which Jesus, as a Jew under the law did, is not what He expects of us now. But He does want obedience to His law of love. There is no merit now in this dispensation of the Spirit, in going into Jordan, or carrying a literal cross like the Catholics, but a far better proof of being a follower of Christ in spirit, would be to manifest His spirit, and to imitate His deeds of kindness, love, sympathy and humility. A plunge or a dip into water may be used to make a *professed follower* of Jesus, but it requires the baptism of the Spirit of the living God to make a REAL FOLLOWER. If we have the Spirit baptism we don't need a symbolic water baptism. If we can't prove by our life and work that we are Christians, we certainly cannot prove it by a water baptism. If we have no better sign or evidence of an inward cleansing than water baptism can impart, then we may well doubt our salvation. If we have the Spirit's seal and witness in our heart, then how weak, carnal, and impotent is the application of literal water to our fleshly body!

It is claimed by some that the Apostles baptized with water. It is certainly true, they did, but was it not John's legal baptism, and prior to "*the time of reformation?*" We don't read of any being baptized in water after the change of dispensations recorded in Heb. 9:10, which Scripture reads thus: "*Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings (Greek and German baptisms), and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation.*" Quoting Heb. 9:10, *The Religious Encyclopedia* says: "There were divers washings, baptisms, enjoined under the former dispensation."

Our water brethren, like Peter in Acts 10:47, are ready to cry out: "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized?" but they are not all as humble and yielding as Peter was when he discovered his mistake, as he tells us in the next chapter, verses 16,17, where he says: "*Then remembered I the*

word of the Lord, how that He said, John indeed baptized with water ; but ye SHALL BE BAPTIZED WITH THE HOLY GHOST. * * * *What was I, that I could withstand God?*" If he could not resist the truth, how can any other person after light beams?

Paul, in 1 Cor. 1:14,17, says: "*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.*" It is common for some ministers to be rather elated by the number of people they have sprinkled or dipped, but compare this with Paul's view.

The friends of water baptism may strive to offset this by saying that Paul admits that he baptized "Crispus and Gaius." We reply, yes, he does admit that he baptized those two. But right there he also says: "*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.*"—1 Cor. 1:14,17. Again it may be insisted: "Well, but he baptized those at all events." We reply, yes, he did, but the customs of the law were still practiced. Paul also observed the "feast in Jerusalem," Acts 18:21; and he sailed away from Philippi "after the days of unleavened bread," Acts 20:6; he shaved his head, "FOR HE HAD A VOW," Acts 18:18; and Timothy he "took and circumcised BECAUSE OF THE JEWS," Acts 16:3. This Paul did while the customs of the law were still observed. But let it be noted that these observances recorded in Acts were some years before "*the time of reformation,*" recorded in Heb. 9:10, and the baptizing of which he speaks in 1 Cor. 1, was five years before the time of reformation." So we see no point which ordinance advocates can make here for water baptism.

"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," or, as some interpret it, *state or dispensation.*—Matt. 28:19,20.

“And He said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.”—Mark 16:15,16.

The above texts are often quoted in defence of water baptism, *but water is not mentioned*, THEREFORE WE HAVE NO AUTHORITY FOR INSERTING IT. In those texts we have the commission of Christ to His disciples, and as John declares that Christ’s baptism will be of the Spirit, we have no authority for saying that Jesus sent out His disciples to baptize with water. And as they were to observe whatsoever He had commanded them, and as there are no Scriptures to prove that He commanded them to baptize with water, we cannot affirm that the baptism of this commission was water.

If water baptism was the baptism of the commission surely Paul should have zealously administered it, but note what is above quoted from him. Indeed, there is nothing in these texts of the commission which implies or demands water. John’s baptism was water, but Christ’s was of the Spirit, and as the baptism of the commission was Christ’s baptism, how could it be other than the Spirit baptism? “*For by one Spirit ARE WE ALL BAPTIZED INTO ONE BODY.*”—I Cor. 12:13, “*One Lord, one faith, one baptism.*”—Eph. 4:5.

Surely no one will deny that the baptism of the commission was Christ’s baptism, neither will any deny that Christ’s baptism was of the Spirit. Now, how can water advocates crowd water into the baptism of the commission, when water is not mentioned? Again, upon the testimony of John the Baptist, how can there be any water in the baptism of the commission, for he most emphatically says: “*I indeed baptize you with water; but ONE MIGHTIER THAN I COMETH, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose: HE SHALL BAPTIZE YOU WITH THE HOLY GHOST and with fire.*—Luke 3:16. *HE MUST INCREASE, but I must decrease.*”—John 3:30.

Regarding the baptism of the Spirit, we have these

promises in the Old Testament: "And *it shall come to pass afterward*, that I will POUR OUT MY SPIRIT upon all flesh," Joel 2:28; and "I WILL POUR MY SPIRIT *upon thy seed*, and my blessing upon thine offspring," Isa. 44:3. Concerning the gift of the Holy Ghost, Peter said: "The promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."—Acts 2:39.

Now how can water baptism be forced into the commission, when even the words of the commission neither mention nor intimate water? The learned Dr. Dale, in his *Judaic Baptism*, declares that the word *baptizo* is frequently used in classic and inspired writings where no physical element is meant, and that the presence of the physical element should be proven, and not taken for granted.

Concerning the commission, (Matt. 28:19) Dr. J. W. Dale says: "Observe that the command is to make disciples of all nations, but discipleship under any teacher is represented as baptism into that teacher. Therefore, Paul asks of those who would be his disciples, 'Were ye baptized in the name of Paul?' (1 Cor. 1:13). The Jews said, 'Thou art His disciple; but we are Moses' disciples (John 9:28), and they refused to be baptized into Christ while they and their fathers were baptized into Moses.'"

"There is, then, no rational ground to doubt, 1. That the nations were to be made disciples of Christ. 2. That the discipleship involved baptism into Christ. 3. That, inasmuch as discipleship of Christ requires repentance and faith, this baptism into Christ is such baptism as is effected by the Holy Ghost. 4. That if any ritual baptism be associated with the real baptism; then the rite can only symbolize the reality. There is an *absolute necessity* for this baptism of the nations into Christ as antecedent and preparative, and also *causative* of the ulterior baptism into the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."

"The Lord Jesus Christ teaches in the most abso-

lute and universal terms, 'No man cometh unto the Father, but by me.' (John 14:6.) It is utterly subversive of all the teachings of Scripture to hold that a sinner can be baptized into the Father, Son and Holy Ghost without first being baptized into a crucified Redeemer. The Lord Jesus says, 'I am the way, no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.' (John 14:6.) Where remission of sins is we have 'boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, By a new and living way. Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.' (Heb. 10:19,20,22.) Unto God in His holiness the sinner in his pollution cannot come. Unto God, in Christ, the 'Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world' (John 1:29), the sinner, in all his guilt, *may come*, MUST COME! When the sinner has come to Christ—has been 'baptized into Him'—'baptized into the remission of sins'—has been invested with His 'fulfillment of all righteousness,' then, and only then, is he prepared to be led by the Mediator between God and man, along the 'new and living way,' by which he can be received by God in His holiness, and be qualified for the ultimate baptism which is forever, even forever and ever, '*into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.*'"

"Thus this wondrous baptism, which is the consummation of the work of redemption, is indissolubly joined with the *baptism of the cross*, and could have no existence without it."

W. J. Allinson of *Friends' Review* says, concerning the baptism of the commission, Matt. 28:19: "It is popularly taken for granted that this word 'baptizing' is to be received in a ceremonial sense. [Our Lord taught of moral, not physical things.] Thus He calls Himself 'the vine,' 'the door,' 'the bread of life,' etc. When His words were too literally taken He shows His sense of the dullness of His hearers: 'How is it that ye do not understand?' (Matt. 16:11.) In the vague, indefinite literal sense of the word *baptize*,

it may mean wash, purge, sprinkle, pour, immerse, stain, ornament, apply, overwhelm, etc., but in a theologic sense, it were rank heresy to deny the proposition that there is but 'ONE BAPTISM.' What that is, and what it is not, we find clearly established; and *in the text under review*, THERE IS NO NAMING OF WATER. It were begging the question to place it there (if it were there I should claim for it its theologic sense); no command to use any outward rite or type; but the promise of the true Baptizer immediately follows: 'Lo, I am with you alway,' etc." (Matt. 28:20).

"Then they are told to 'teach, baptizing' (not *teach and baptize* as two distinct things), which must mean, preaching only under the Divine influence, the Holy Spirit, the *one baptism* shall accompany the word preached, carrying it to the souls of the hearers with convicting power, 'purifying their hearts by faith.' Teaching under holy inspiration was to be *the Spirit's act through an instrument*, and the 'one baptism,' the Spirit's act direct, was to accompany, and unto God should be all the glory. Peter, an apostle, was, by simultaneous revelation to himself and to Cornelius, required to go to a company of *Gentiles* and teach baptizingly. The words of his teaching were given to him by the Spirit, and the baptism was given to them by the Spirit. To confirm the fact so that there could be no gainsaying, it was *visibly conferred*. Peter told the Church the astonishing story, 'As I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that He said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.'" (Acts 11:15,16.)

There is positively no scripture record that Christ ever commissioned His apostles or disciples to baptize with water. But John the Baptist, under the Jewish economy, did baptize with water, in accord with the dispensation of rites and ceremonies. John declares that his baptism is of water, so separating it from

Christ's baptism of the Spirit. Both John and Jesus testify to two opposite and distinct baptisms, one with water and one of the Spirit. It is plainly intimated that *they shall never be united*, and THAT THE ONE OF WATER SHALL PASS AWAY, and the ONE OF THE SPIRIT REMAIN, "*By one Spirit ARE WE ALL BAPTIZED INTO ONE BODY.*" (I Cor. 12:13.) Water baptism does not baptize into one body, but it is productive of a host of jarring, jangling sects, each one of which clamors for its particular mode, while *not one mode is given in the Bible.*

Again we quote one of the texts that embodies the commission: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them IN THE NAME (water not mentioned) of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."—Matt. 28:19. This is what water advocates claim as a strong plea for water baptism, but the text does not mention water. On the expression "*in the name*" seems to be where they force in the water, but the text does not say *into water*, but it does say "*into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.*" Is the name of the Lord here to be taken as a mere expression or sound of words? Does IN THE NAME not stand for *virtue, power, and heavenly influence*, which is alone characteristic of the Great Godhead? Does not Jesus bring out this truth: "I have manifested *Thy name* unto the men which Thou gavest me out of the world. Holy Father, keep *through THINE OWN NAME* those whom Thou hast given me. I kept them *in Thy name.*"—John 17:6, 11, 12. Additional New Testament testimony to the virtue and power of *the name* is as follows: "Even the devils are subject unto us through *THY NAME,*" Luke 10:17; "That believing ye might *have life through HIS NAME,*" John 20:31; "And *His name through faith in His name HATH MADE THIS MAN STRONG,*" Acts 3:16; "Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by *the name* of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by Him *doth this man stand here before you whole,*" Acts 4:10; "Neither is

there salvation in any other: for *there is none other name* under Heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved," Acts 4:12; "As many as received Him, to them *gave He power to become the Sons of God*, even to THEM THAT BELIEVE ON HIS NAME."—John 1:12. The same truth is brought out in the Old Testament. "*The name of the Lord* IS A STRONG TOWER: the righteous runneth into it, and is safe."—Prov. 18:10. "They that know *Thy name* will put their trust in Thee."—Psa. 9:10. "*Thy name* is as ointment poured forth."—Cant. 1:3. "*Save me, O GOD, BY THY NAME*, and judge me by Thy strength."—Psa. 54:1.

Joseph Phipps, while dwelling upon Matt. 28:19, the text of the commission in his admirable work entitled: "*True Christian Baptism and Communion*," says: "Into the internal virtue and influence of the sacred and all-sufficient *name* or Spirit, are all the truly regenerate measurably baptized; for 'If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His.'—Rom. 8:9.

Robert Barclay, in commenting on this same text, Matt. 28:19, says: "Now the *name* of the Lord is often taken in Scripture for something else than a bare sound of words, or literal expression, even for His virtue and power as may appear from Psa. 54:1; Cant. 1:3; Prov. 18:10; and in many more. Now, that the apostles were by their ministry to baptize the nations into His name, virtue, and power, and that they did so is evident by the testimony of Paul where he saith: 'For, as many of you as have been baptized *into Christ* HAVE PUT ON CHRIST' (Gal. 3:27). This must have been a baptizing *into the name*, i. e. POWER AND VIRTUE, and not a mere formal expression of words adjoined with water baptism; because as hath been above observed, it doth not follow as a natural or necessary consequence of it."

Dr. J. W. Dale in his work on baptism says: "Discipleship under any teacher is represented as baptism into that teacher. The discipleship involved baptism into Christ. Inasmuch as discipleship of Christ requires repentance and faith, this baptism into Christ is such baptism as is effected by the Holy Ghost. Thus this wondrous baptism which is the consummation of the work of redemption, is indissolubly joined with the baptism of the commission, and could have no existence without it."

In view of all this, and the wide range and diversified use and meaning of the word baptize, is it not reasonable to infer that the command in the commission was to go out and teach all nations, initiating them into a real knowledge of the true God, an infusing of them "*into the name*" (power, influence, spirit) of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? Certain at least, it is *that water is not mentioned in the text*. Certain it is that CHRIST'S BAPTISM IS OF THE SPIRIT. Certain it is that there is now ONLY "ONE BAPTISM," (Eph. 4:5). Certain it is that "*by one Spirit ARE WE ALL BAPTIZED INTO ONE BODY.*" (1 Cor. 12:13).

Even if the baptism of the commission as given in Matt. 28:19, Mark 16:15,16, was plainly declared to be a water baptism (which it of course is not) it would only have been binding during the dispensation of rites and ceremonies, and would have ceased after "*the time of reformation*" (Heb. 9:10), thirty-one years after, and could have no force now, and especially not with Gentile believers who were never bound to the legal observances of Judaism.

Many Christians are like Apollos; he was a Jew, keeping the law, and in Acts 18:25,26 we read: "This man was instructed in the way of the Lord; and being fervent in the spirit, he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, *knowing only the baptism of John*. And he began to speak boldly in the synagogue: whom when Aquila and Priscilla had heard, *they took*

him unto them, AND EXPOUNDED UNTO HIM THE WAY OF GOD MORE PERFECTLY." So, because "*knowing only the baptism of John,*" he needed wisdom beyond that. Just so, to-day, there are many good, well-meaning people in the same condition.

Perhaps with Apollos and many others, being Israelites, and having an attachment for the rites of the old covenant, it was difficult all at once to overcome a long-established custom and Jewish prejudice. And if we practice water baptism to-day because they did, we have progressed no further into the things of the Spirit in that particular.

Let us heed the declaration of John: "*I indeed baptize you with water; but ONE MIGHTIER THAN I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose: He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.*"—Luke 3:16. "*He must increase, but I MUST DECREASE.*"—John 3:30. In the minds of some there is a doubt as to whether or not God intrusts His servants with any part or place in the bringing-about of the Spirit baptism, but do not the following Scriptures intimate that He does?

"Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, *but with the Spirit* of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart. Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, (the law) but of the Spirit: for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life."—2 Cor. 3:3,6.

"Preached the gospel unto you *with the Holy Ghost* sent down from Heaven."—1 Peter 1:12.

"My speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but *in demonstration of the Spirit* and of power: That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but *in the power of God.*"—1 Cor. 2:4,5. "For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but *also in power, and in the Holy Ghost,* and in much assurance."—1 Thess. 1:5.

The *Spirit baptism* is something that draws the children of God together and nourishes their souls in

sweet, mutual fellowship. It ignites in the soul of kindred saints. "*For by one Spirit* are we ALL BAPTIZED INTO ONE BODY * * * and have been all made to *drink into one Spirit.*"—I Cor. 12:13.

There is certainly, at times, at least, a Spirit baptizing or influencing power or condition that accompanies the faithful preaching and teaching of the gospel. God surely condescends to use men in the imparting of "spiritual gifts" (Rom. 1:11); in the begetting of children "*through the gospel*" (I Cor. 4:15), and in the turning of sinners "from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God" (Acts 26:18).

"One Lord, *one faith*, ONE BAPTISM."—Eph. 4:5. "*For by one Spirit are we all baptized in one body.*"—I Cor. 12:13. The word baptize or baptism does not necessarily always refer to the application of water. We may be baptized, influenced, or enveloped, in, or with, joy, grief, anger, or love, all of which are absolutely apart from water. The mother of Zebedee's children asked a great thing of Christ, but He said: "Are ye able to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?"—Matt. 20:22. Again He declared, "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!"—Luke 12:50. In both instances He here refers to a baptism of mental and bodily suffering.

Water is not to be understood always when the word baptism is mentioned. Paul, in Eph. 4:5, says there is only "*one baptism*;" in I Cor. 12:13 he says that "*by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body.*" Now, if it is true as some would teach, that there are still two baptisms, one of water and the other of the Spirit, then Paul made a mistake. And if it is true, as some state, that water baptism is the door into the Church or the sign of discipleship, then Paul made another mistake.

To be consistent these people who insist on literal water whenever baptism is mentioned, might also insist on literal fire when fire is mentioned in connection

with baptism. It is a poor rule that won't work both ways.

The learned Dr. J. W. Dale, in his work on baptism says: "The master-key to the interpretation of *baptizo* is CONDITION,—condition characterized by completeness, with or without physical envelopment. **WHAT-EVER IS CAPABLE OF THOROUGHLY CHANGING THE CHARACTER, STATE OR CONDITION OF ANY OBJECT IS CAPABLE OF BAPTIZING THAT OBJECT; AND BY SUCH CHANGE OF CHARACTER, STATE OR CONDITION DOES IN FACT BAPTIZE IT.**"

"There is *no form of act inherent in baptizo*. The conception that any word expressive of condition can be self-limited as to the form of the act or agency effecting such condition, is an error."

"Baptism is a myriad-sided word, adjusting itself to the most diverse cases. It has no form of act of its own; it asks for none; it accepts indifferently, of any, of all, competent to meet its demand—*change of condition*."

"Neither Paul, nor any other minister of Christ, was ever sent to preach a ritual baptism. The Christian commission is to preach Christ and His baptism (who never baptized with water), and the man of whose ministry it can be justly said, his preaching is the preaching of a ritual ordinance, cannot be one of those whom Christ has sent to preach the gospel."

Only Israelites were under the law. Gentiles were exempt from observing the ceremonials of Judaism. A careful perusal of the 15th chapter of Acts makes this clear. It was concerning Cornelius that Peter received the lesson in a trance in which God taught him that what He had cleansed, man should not call common or unclean. See Acts 10:10-33. It was also concerning him that Peter said: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: But in every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him."—Acts 10:34,35.

Again ordinance Christians quote the exclamations of Ananias to Paul, "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord," Acts 22:16; but it is hardly necessary to say that Paul, before Christ stopped him on the way to Damascus, was a Jew of the strictest kind, and his conversion and Ananias' exhortation occurred A. D. 35, twenty-nine years before "*the time of reformation.*" Moreover Paul, while relating his conversion and Ananias's exhortation to him to be baptized, speaks of Ananias as "a devout man according to the law, having a good report of *all the Jews.*" See Acts 22:6-16. Still they will persist in producing 1 Peter 3:21: "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God), *by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.*" Does that invest water baptism with saving merit? The text says it is "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God." Is the baptism, then, of water, or that one which produces a good conscience? Water cannot cleanse the sinner's heart or conscience—the Spirit can.

The text says it is "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh," the ceremonial washing or baptism of the law would do that, but the text says it is "*the answer of a good conscience toward God, BY THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST.*" Now, water cannot give "the answer of a good conscience toward God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ," but the Spirit baptism can and does! Now, which is the baptism referred to in the text, water, or Spirit?"

"The like figure." That the Apostle here refers to water baptism as a figure of the Spirit baptism seems evident. If he means to use water baptism both as being the figure and the thing figured, then he simply uses one figure to represent another. How could this be, since types are used to point to substances? Would it not be a glaring misuse of figurative lan-

guage to endeavor to make one figure, sign, or type represent another figure, sign or type? Would it not be absurd to use one figure as the anti-type of another? Types were used to point to substances or realities. Where, in Scripture, was one figure used to represent another figure?

Dr. Mitchell, of Derby, in a sermon on the purpose of the Gospel, says: "Christianity does not attempt to substitute one rite in the room of others which have been abrogated, but to bring men back to a strict regard to natural and moral duties."

Noah and his family were not saved by the deluging waters of the flood which drowned the wicked race, but they were saved *by being sheltered within the Ark*. Are we now saved by water baptism, or by being sheltered in Christ, the Ark of Safety?

Who will say that water baptism would have made the thief on the cross more meet for Paradise than he was when Jesus declared that he should be there with Him? Who will say that Simon the Sorcerer, who was presumably baptized with legal water baptism was any the better for it since it was afterward said to him: "I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity."—Acts 8:23.

Among all the manifold and conflicting modes of administering water baptism, so unkindly, often, contended for by Christians, *not one form is mentioned in the New Testament*. Not a word is said about dipping, sprinkling, or pouring, hence no person can adopt either mode and prove it by the New Testament to be *the* mode. If Jesus had intended us to observe this Jewish symbol of purification in the spiritual dispensation, would He not have told us so, and have prescribed the exact mode for its administration?

The observers of the rite of water baptism often refer to the fact that some of the early Christians observed the ceremony, and claim this to be a strong point in its favor. True some of the Second and

Third Century Christians did adopt the legal ceremony of water baptism, and the church hastily drifted into the conditions that ushered in Popery and Catholicism, as is elsewhere more fully shown in this work. But let us read the testimony of some of these early Christians regarding water baptism as recorded in history, and we shall see how far from being spiritual-minded in the matter some of them were.

Chrysostom (Greek, died A. D. 407) said: "Although a man should be foul with every vice, the blackest that can be named, yet should he fall into the baptismal pool, he ascends from the divine waters purer than the beams of noon; he is made just in a moment. They who approach the baptismal font, although fornicators, etc., are not only made clean, but holy also, and just. As a spark thrown into the ocean is instantly extinguished, so is sin (be it what it may) extinguished when the man is thrown into the laver of regeneration."

Tertullian (Latin, died between A. D. 220-240) said: "We are three times plunged into the water, and when we are taken up, we taste a mixture of milk and honey. When we go to meat, when we lie down, sit down, and whatever business we have, we make on our foreheads the sign of the cross. *If you search the Scriptures for any command for these and such like usages, you shall find none.* TRADITION will be urged to you as the ground of them—custom as the confirmation of them—and our religion teaches us to observe them."

These ancient Christians are often now referred to as the "early Christian fathers," but such crude and carnal ideas of baptism deserve to be rejected, whether advocated by either the ancient or modern teachers. Tertullian, above quoted, seems to have had a controversy with some who rejected water baptism, for Robinson, the Baptist historian, declares that Tertullian.

said to some, the following : “ You act naturally, for you are serpents, and serpents love deserts and avoid water ; but we, like fishes, *are born in the water, and are safe by continuing in it.*”

Surely, this “ ancient father ” would have made a very zealous modern “ hard-shell ” Baptist or a very good Campbellite, for the latter two make more of an idol out of water baptism, perhaps, than any other of the water sects.

Tertullian may have supposed that he was making a strong point out of his *snake figure*, but he seems to have not known that some species of snakes are in their element when in the water, and out of it when on dry land.

Cyril (*Fourth Century*) says : “ If anyone desires to know why grace is given by means of water and not by means of any of the other elements, searching the Divine Scriptures he will find out. For water is some great thing. Water was the beginning of the world, and the Jordan was the beginning of the Gospels.”

There are water advocates to-day just as much in the dark as this ancient Saint, and like him, fancy that “ *Water is some great thing.*”

In Acts 8:27-39 is given the account of Philip and the Eunuch. This man was returning *from Jerusalem, where he had been to worship*, and was sitting in his chariot reading the Old Testament Scriptures. He asked Philip to sit with him, and Philip “ preached unto him Jesus,” *not water*, ver. 35. But in ver. 36. the Eunuch (not Philip) said : “ See, here is water ; what doth hinder me to be baptized ? ” Just as with others, *subject to the rites of Moses*, he was occupied with the Jewish rite of water baptism. But it may be argued that Philip readily granted the Eunuch’s request for water baptism. True, he did, but it is also true that Paul just as readily *circumcised Timothy*

“BECAUSE OF THE JEWS WHICH WERE IN THOSE QUARTERS.”—Acts 16:3. This baptism of the Eunuch by water occurred A. D. 34, thirty years before “*the time of reformation.*”

Some assert that water baptism is plainly taught in Rom. 6:3,4. It says: “Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized *into Jesus Christ* (not water) were *baptized into His death?* Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism (it does not say by water) into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.”

If we must see water in the baptism into Christ, we may just as consistently see wood in the cross which all Christians must more or less bear. Moreover, all the literal water on earth would not cleanse a sinner so as to enable him to “*walk in newness of life.*” But the baptism of the Spirit can and does. Now what baptism is meant in the text, water, or Spirit?

Is the inference not that *like as Christ was raised by the Father*, so we are raised from the grave of sin to walk in newness of life. None can deny that the raising of Christ by the Father was by a divine, a spiritual power, and if the text says of us, “*Like as Christ was raised,*” we cannot say that the baptism means that of literal water. Christ’s baptism is of the Spirit, in contrast with the law’s, which was water.

Gal. 3:27 says: “For as many of you as have been *baptized into Christ* (not into water) have *put on Christ.*” Surely no intelligent Bible Christian will say that ten thousand immersions in water would baptize a person “*into Christ,*” or give power to “*put on Christ.*” But “*by one Spirit ARE WE ALL BAPTIZED INTO ONE BODY.*”—I Cor, 12:13.

In the dispensation of grace no baptism is to continue in force except the baptism of Christ, and as His baptism is of the Spirit only, therefore water baptism is not Christ’s, and is no longer in force. Some will say that water baptism is the outward sign of the inward cleansing. How devoid of spiritual discern-

ment is such reasoning. If a person don't prove by the life, walk and conversation that regeneration has taken place, a million dips into water could not prove it. On the other hand, an infidel might be baptized in water, but it would not prove that he was a Saint.

Col. 2:12 says: "Buried with Him in baptism (nothing is said of water), wherein also ye are *risen with Him* THROUGH THE FAITH OF THE OPERATION OF GOD, who hath raised Him from the dead." People whose spiritual discernment has been clouded by traditional teaching and training understand this burial to be in a stream or pool of water (as we once did), and that a man must raise the dripping body out of the water! But *does the verse mention water?* Does it say we are raised *by man, or by God?* If we are *raised with Christ* "through the faith of *the operation of God,*" has a man anything to do with it? And is water connected with a transaction that is said to be wrought "*by the operation of God?*"

Christ's burial in the grave was literal, and those who want to couple it thus with a literal water baptism by immersion must remember that to actually follow it the candidate would have to remain three days under water.

In favor of water some quote John 3:5, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Here we understand the word water to mean the Word. We have this proven in 1 Peter 1:23, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God." Again, "That He might sanctify and cleanse it *with the washing of water* BY THE WORD."—Eph. 5:26.

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."—Mark 16:16. Ritualists say that this means water, *but the text does not* say so. Whom shall we believe? Dip an unregenerate man into water, and an unsaved sinner he comes out. But when a man truly repents of sin, and with the heart believes in the Lord Jesus Christ,

he receives a spiritual washing and cleansing, a genuine renewal of the inner man, in contrast with which spiritual baptism, a plunge in literal water is but a hollow form.

As the above-mentioned baptism in Mark 16:16 is Christ's, which is spiritual in fulfillment of John's, which was water, how can it refer to water baptism? Even if this text and those above should plainly refer to water (which they do not), still it, with everything typical, became void after Heb. 9:10. "*I indeed have baptized you with water* : but HE SHALL BAPTIZE YOU WITH THE HOLY GHOST."—Mark 1:8. "*He must increase, but I must decrease.*"—John 3:30. "For John *truly baptized with water* ; but YE SHALL BE BAPTIZED WITH THE Holy Ghost not many days hence."—Acts 1:5.

William B. Orvis, an eminent Baptist minister and author, in "*Ritualism Dethroned*," says : "Why perpetuate both the type and the anti-type under the same dispensation? Why need the symbol when you already possess the reality? Why look at a shadow when you see the substance? Why look at a satellite when you can behold the sun itself? Why look through a glass darkly, when you behold with open face the glory of the Lord? Why stoop to a carnal element, when you have already the correspondent spiritual essence? or why mingle Judaism with Christianity?"

"A large class of persons have dwelt so much on the subject of baptism that whenever they read the term baptism in the Bible, or even the term *water*, they seem to take it for granted that water baptism is intended, unless the evidence to the contrary is palpable on the very face of the passage. Thus, when they read such passages as John 3:5, 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit;' Heb. 10:22, 'Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water;' Titus 3:5, 'By the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the

Holy Ghost ;' Eph. 5:26, 'That He might sanctify and cleanse it (the Church) with the washing of water by the Word,' and 1 John 5:8, 'There are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood,' they almost invariably assume that water baptism is designated by the term 'water' or the washing. So, more especially, when the word *baptism* or its cognate is found, they have no other thought than that water baptism is the thing specified. Take the following passages, Mark 16:16, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved ;' 1 Cor. 10:2, 'And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea ;' Rom. 6:4, 'Buried with Him by baptism ;' Eph. 4:5, 'One Lord, one faith, one baptism ;' in these and all similar passages this class of interpreters find nothing but water baptism."

"Water, being an element that purifies, and also most cheering and reviving in a desert and sultry clime ; yea, even essential to life itself, everywhere, is much used metaphorically to describe the joys and spiritual graces of religion, and the purifying influences of God's Word and Spirit, and even of the blood of Christ itself. And so, the term baptism (the term denoting purifying in its literal import) is often used to signify a moral cleansing, whether by the Holy Ghost or by faith in Christ, *i. e.*, faith uniting to Christ, and the imbibing or receiving a new life from Christ. We will cite a few of the many passages of Scripture where the term water is thus used metaphorically, as above stated, and then let us see whether the term *baptism* is also thus used : Psa. 23:2, 'He leadeth me beside the still waters ;' Isa. 44:3, 'I will pour water upon him that is thirsty ;' Isa. 55:1, 'Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters ;' Jer. 2:13, 'My people * * * have forsaken me the fountain of living waters ;' Ez. 36:25, 'Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you ;' Zech. 14:8, 'Living waters shall go out from Jerusalem ;' John 4:10, 'He would have given thee living water ;' John 4:14, 'Shall be in him a well of water ;' Heb. 10:22, 'Having our hearts

sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water ;' 2 Peter 2:17, 'Wells without water ;' Jude 12, 'Clouds without water ;' 1 John 5:6,7,8, 'Came by water and blood,' 'three that bear record, Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost ;' Rev. 7:17, 'The Lamb * * * shall lead them unto living fountains of waters ;'—21:6, 'I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life,'—22:1, 'He showed me a pure river of water of life,' etc. So, water is often used to represent people's troubles, afflictions, etc., as 'Though the Lord give you * * * the water of affliction.'—Is. 30:20. In the above cases, you will perceive, water is used metaphorically ? And now, we ask, is the term baptism also used metaphorically ? The evidence is just as clear. See Luke 12:50, 'I have a baptism to be baptized with ; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished ;' Matt. 20:22, 'Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with ?' It is certainly here metaphorically used to represent sufferings. So, Christian writers often speak of a baptism of love, of power, of tears, of blood, of sorrow, and of sufferings, etc."

"So all those passages which speak of being baptized into Christ (and they are many) refer to the soul being consecrated to Christ, and purified by His Spirit—having no reference whatever to water baptism. So, in every passage which speaks of being baptized with the Holy Ghost (or with fire), of course no water is there included, and these passages are also many."

"In Mark 16:16, baptism is ranked with a spiritual grace, which every one knows is essential to salvation ; a purely mental state or exercise ! Now, does Jesus Christ intend to rank a purely external rite thus with an internal grace as essential to salvation ? Does He thus join things utterly dissimilar and incongruous ? We think not ! Spiritual baptism or purifying, like faith, is essential to salvation—water baptism, every one knows, is not. (The same incongruity may be

noted in the common interpretation of Eph. 4:5, where baptism is also ranked with faith.”)

“In Matt. 28:19, the second clause of the verse ‘baptizing them,’ etc., appears to be expletive, referring to the manner or result of obeying the command, ‘Go ye therefore, and teach (disciple) all nations.’ How or to what end? ‘Baptizing (or purifying) them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.’”

“Paul received the apostolic commission here given, yet he says, 1 Cor. 1:17, ‘Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel.’ He is here discoursing on the dissensions that had already arisen concerning ritual baptism. And could he thus disavow the obligation to baptize, had Christ commanded water baptism in Matt. 28:19? Most manifestly he could not. But in the 14th to the 16th verses of the chapter (1 Cor. 1) the apostle thanks God that he had baptized so few. What should we think of an apostle that thanks God, that he has not obeyed the command of his Divine Master! which is the case with Paul, if water baptism is intended in Matt. 28:19.”

“Paul says, Eph. 4:5, ‘One Lord, one faith, one baptism,’ by which, as hinted above, it would be incongruous to understand water baptism as one act, or one mode of baptism, as some argue, but one REAL BAPTISM; the true gospel baptism—the essential baptism of the Holy Ghost.”

“These passages, Matt. 28:19, and Mark 16:16, are doubtless parallels, and have parallels in the other evangelists. They all unquestionably record the same commission, and those parallel passages are Luke 24:45-50, and John 20:21-23.”

“In Luke (24:47) the injunction is, that, *repentance and remission of sins* should be preached, to which end the disciples were to tarry until they were endowed with *power from on high*. In John (20:22-23) it is said that Jesus breathed on them, saying, ‘Receive ye the Holy Ghost,’ and immediately adds, ‘whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted, unto them; and whose

soever sins ye retain, they are retained.' Now, with our interpretation of the great commission, and of the term *baptize* as there employed, the meaning of these passages is clear. The apostles and other disciples were to preach the gospel under the influence of the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven—and thus instrumentally secure the baptism of the Holy Ghost upon others—and consequently the forgiving and purifying of their sins, a thing which could in nowise be secured by water baptism. Spiritual purification then, is clearly the thing enjoined. Thus we have the four evangelists perfectly harmonized, and each equally harmonized with Paul, 1 Cor 1:17, and Eph. 4:5."

"Keeping in mind the common use of the term baptism, to represent any species of purifying, and that the spiritual was that sought by the gospel of Jesus Christ, will help us out of many difficulties on the subject, and save us from those endless blunders, and the present perils of teaching the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Had the term *baptize* been translated *purify* or *convert*,—as Beecher and Campbell have abundantly shown ought to have been—aye, as it has been, *i. e.*, by its cognate 'wash,' whenever it has been translated in the New Testament, much obscurity and liability to *carnalize* the meaning, would have been removed."

"Keep it before the mind, that salvation is not in any outward form, 'not of works,' lest any man should boast, as though he were his own saviour: nor is it hinged on any contingency of what one man may do outwardly for another: salvation is not conveyed, nor withheld thus by any interposing medium. Man is not thus at the mercy of an administrator, or dependent on priestly or canonical absolution for pardon or purifying. Let this dogma of the Papacy be seen in its legitimate bearings, and it will explode the whole fabric of ritualism from topstone to the foundation."

"Union of Christians can never be attained on the basis of agreement in forms—never was—never will be,—nor even by agreement in non-essentials of any

kind. Neither can we believe that God has placed any such barrier in the way. The divine law cannot be accused of any such absurdity as to require both agreement and union, where only one is possible. Nay, we had better drop the carnal ordinances, and take the spiritual counter-type—drop the type, and take the anti-type. In Holy Spirit baptism we have all the Christian graces—all the fruits of holiness, and endless peace, in the churches also; aye, in the happy exchange, we have lost sight of the shadow, but have grasped the substance.”

“And this attempt to plead God’s authority for and magnify the importance of water baptism, manifests the fatuity and utter delusion of ritualism in all the Christian ages. It is the perverter and crucifier of rightly directed Christian zeal and love—the bane of revivals—the stumbling stone ever in the way of young converts—the illusion that rivets the chains of sect—the folly and madness that renders the labors of Christ’s peacemakers useless, because fruitless—the idol that dethrones Christ as our Saviour, our life, and our union—and the apology for the besetting sin of bigotry, that undervalues and grieves forever away the Holy Spirit from so many nominal brotherhoods in the Christian faith.”

“*Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, WHY, as though living in the world, ARE YE SUBJECT TO ORDINANCES?*’ (Col. 2:20.) *‘Blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances THAT WAS AGAINST US, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, NAILING IT TO HIS CROSS.’* (Col. 2:14.) *‘Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings (Greek and German baptisms), and CARNAL ORDINANCES, IMPOSED ON THEM UNTIL THE TIME OF REFORMATION.’*” (Heb. 9:10.)

“The proof-texts we here cite will bear as appropriately against the doctrine of the divine appointment and sacredness of the one ordinance as the other; since they both partake equally of the nature of a ‘hand-writing,’ or a ‘carnal ordinance;’ differing not at all

in this respect from any Jewish ceremonial, whether it were the passover, the 'feast of weeks,' 'pentecost,' or any of their 'divers baptisms.'"

"I know it has been customary to interpret the passages I shall cite, as referring to the Jewish ceremonial law, but not as referring to a *Christian ceremonial law*! Now, where these Bible interpreters obtained their distinction between the two ritual systems (if two there be), the writer certainly is uninformed. If any of them will show me what passages in the New Testament, which war against the bondage of ordinances and rituals, refer to the Jewish and which to the Christian dispensation—or will do that which is equivalent, viz.: show that they all refer to the Jewish ceremonial law, and cannot, either in fact or in the nature of things, have any reference to *Christian* ordinances (I use a borrowed term), I will confess myself much enlightened."

"Now, is it not demonstrably certain, that this whole process of making a distinction between Jewish and Christian ordinances is not only a distinction without a difference, but has also grown out of the assumption that Jesus Christ or the apostles have instituted certain ordinances, and hence these apostolic warnings against ordinances must be *assumed* not to refer to the Christian, but to the Jewish ordinances? Is there, in fact, any other foundation for the supposed distinction than this bare assumption? We certainly know of none other. The truth is, the whole drift of Paul's reasoning on the subject shows that he regarded the evil of the Jewish ritual law to consist, not in the fact that it was inapt or inappropriate to the Christian dispensation, but in that it was a *ritual law*. Baptism with water is the same in one dispensation that it is in another: so is a ceremonial feast. If the one is a 'carnal ordinance,' the other cannot be conversely a spiritual one!"

"Paul is not to be supposed to have labored in nearly all his epistles so earnestly to break the power of a ritual law, merely to supplant the one by another,

which, in verity, is no better ; but, in fact, if established, is left far more indefinite than the former. Who can read Paul's epistles to the Romans, his first and second to the Corinthians, his epistle to the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Colossians ; his epistles to Timothy and Titus, and to the Hebrews, without reaching the utmost strength of conviction that he was laying the axe at the root of the tree of ritualism, and endeavoring to direct both Jew and Gentile to the true spiritual nature of the Christian religion, and to the passing away of signs and symbols, by the glorious coming of Him who is the true anti-type—the presence and all-glorious substance? ”

“ Take specific passages : Heb. 9:10, ‘ *Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings (baptisms), and CARNAL ORDINANCES, imposed on them until the time of reformation.* ’ Now, in the context of this chapter, for two chapters preceding and two or three succeeding, the apostle has grouped together nearly every element of the Jewish law, and sacrificial and ritual services, and enumerated them thus with their baptisms ; and, having done this, he contrasts them all with the truly spiritual services of the Christian dispensation. Mark : he does not contrast them with certain *substituted* forms and rituals of the New Covenant, but contrasts the *forms* of the Old with the *spirituality* of the New. ‘ The priesthood being changed, ’ (he says, Heb. 7:12) ‘ there is made of necessity a change also of the law, ’ *i. e.*, the ritual gives place to the spiritual. Under the old law all things were to be made according to the *outward* pattern shown in the mount. In the ninth chapter all these *earthly* forms and figures are shown to have given place to the *heavenly*. ”

“ So, also, in the context of the passage we cited from Colossians, *baptism* is grouped with other ceremonies, and especially with that in the stead of which it is said to stand, *viz.*: circumcision ; and the Christian is directed (not to *baptism* in its place) but to that circumcision made without hands, as in Hebrews,

to the tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man, and (Col. 2:12) to the *baptism* wherein we rise with Christ through the faith of the operation of God. That is the kind of baptism we need; and the kind of circumcision also. And either of these in the outward form are equally the handwriting of ordinances, which ever were against the universal peace and unity of the church, and hence, as Paul tells us, are blotted out, nailing them to His cross, and triumphing over them in it."

"In Rom. 6:1-5, our attention is unquestionably turned from the outward to the same spiritual baptism. In Eph. 2:15, we have almost precisely similar language in respect to ordinances as that quoted above from Col. 2, except that neither circumcision nor baptism are specifically mentioned. In Eph. 2:15, the *enmity*, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, is said to be abolished to make of twain one new man, so making peace. And in 1 Cor. 12:13, we are said by *one Spirit* to be all baptized into one body. Now you perfectly well know that this was never done by any one outward baptism, for the outward tends to the reverse. The admission of a ceremonial law of any kind has ever proved, as Paul reasons in 2 Cor. 3, a ministration of death, and fills with that zeal of the Pharisee the same apostle speaks of in Phil. 3, which leads to persecution of the church, and not at all characteristic of that spiritual house, that chosen generation, that royal priesthood, which Peter so graphically describes (1 Peter 2) as offering spiritual sacrifices."

Dr. Halley, who published seven lectures on ordinances in 1844, complains as follows: "That he finds the subject fraught with long and wearisome controversies, and perplexed with difficulties, so that cause is afforded *to such as deny the perpetuity of those rites* to entertain serious objections to the views of the several parties, seeing that they cannot agree among themselves on the meaning of the commission and

authority which they say they have received for these observances. Each party deprecates, refutes, and severely denounces the views of others! *There seems, indeed, no refuge from such difficulties, but in taking a spiritual view of the baptism required.* The washing away of sin is a solemn reality, and no ceremonial representation; to be performed by the Holy Spirit, and not by man himself."

Bishop Barlow, of Lincoln, writes: "There is neither precept nor example for pedo-baptism, nor any just evidence of it for about two hundred years after Christ. Tertullian condemns it as an unwarrantable custom; and Nazianzen, a good while after him, dislikes it too. In the primitive times they were Catechumeni, then Illuminati or Baptizati. The truth is that pedo-baptism came into the world in the Second Century, and in the Third and Fourth began to be practiced, though not generally, and defended as lawful from the mistaken text, John 3:5. On the same gross mistake of John 6:53, they did for many centuries, both in the Greek and Latin churches, give the Lord's Supper to infants, and I confess they might do both as well as either."

Samuel Drew, a noted Methodist minister, and one of the very able metaphysical reasoners of his day, says concerning a work by Robert Barclay, the Quaker Reformer: "I have never yet met with any arguments for the perpetuity of water-baptism so conclusive as those of Robert Barclay against its continuance. It is, I think, but fair to conclude that if this were to be a standing ordinance, more explicit directions would have been left concerning it."

Dr. Trapp, of Oxford, declares: "With water the pollution of the flesh is put away, but by Christ's baptism with the Spirit the answer of a good conscience is known, purged from dead works to Godward."

William Deil, a minister of Caius College, Cambridge, in his treatise on the *Doctrine of Baptism*, says : “ The baptism of Christ is Spirit or fire baptism ; and this is the one and only baptism of the New Testament. Its outward instrument is not material water, but the Word ; as Christ shows, where He says, ‘ teach, baptizing,’ showing that teaching the Word is the outward means of baptizing with the Spirit, which is sufficient for all the faithful. He that is truly washed from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, what need hath he of material water to be poured on his body, under the pretence of any sign whatever, when he hath the truth, substance, and heavenly thing itself ? ”

Dr. Wardlaw says : “ It is surely little better than trifling to institute an inquiry whether those on whom the ‘ promise of the Father,’ the ‘ power from on high ’ so wonderfully came, were ever subjected to the sprinkling or the immersion of water ! In such a case it was a matter of very little moment, indeed, whether they were, or were not. That they *were not* seems far more likely ; perhaps, may be held for certain. They were already believers in the resurrection of Jesus and their baptism—not the mere emblem, but the celestial reality—came immediately from the hand of their glorified Master ; who having ‘ ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.’ (Eph. 4:8.) He ‘ being by the right hand of God exalted ’ (Acts 2:33) shed forth that which the assembled multitudes saw and heard with such overwhelming amazement. *Truly the baptism with water might well be dispensed with for this.* ”

Dr. Cumming says : “ To bring man directly to God, just as he is, is the grand characteristic of true religion. To keep man from God, and detain him with the priest, the sacraments, the ceremony, is the grand effort of all false religions. We may not place baptism in the room of the Holy Spirit, nor the

eucharist in the place of the Lord Jesus. We must look far above and beyond them both."

John Allen says: "While many Christians profess to believe that baptism or sprinkling with water was enjoined by our Lord, and is productive of spiritual blessings, such will do well to apply the simple text which He recommended: 'Ye shall know them by their fruits' (Matt. 7:16), and to consider whether those who have received the rite give evidence in their lives of any high benefits derived from it; or whether, on the contrary, it has been totally unproductive of spiritual grace, leaving them in the same position as those who have never received it. If the latter must be admitted, then another reflection forcibly arises, whether the nature of our Lord's injunction has not been mistaken by giving it an outward interpretation when He designed it to be understood in a spiritual sense."

Henry Hammond, Chaplain to King Charles I, says in his Annotations on the New Testament: "Is not Christ the end of ceremonies, types, figures and shadows? John's water-baptism, and all the shadows of Moses were to endure but for a time, for as all the prophets were until John, so John was until Christ; and Christ by His internal washing—the laver of regeneration—fulfilled and ended not only Moses' laver, but John's Jordan washing also, by fulfilling inwardly that which they represented outwardly."

In a work entitled "*Christian Baptism Spiritual, not Ritual*," Dr. Robert McNaer, a noted Presbyterian minister says: "Whatever is meant by the words 'born of water and of the Spirit,' is absolutely necessary to salvation. But will the Protestant venture to affirm, in the ritual sense, that no unbaptized man, woman, or child can be saved? If this be so, who then can be sure that he is safe? And what is the inquirer to do? or when may he rest satisfied that he is born of

water? so long as the vexed questions of who are authorized to administer the ordinance, and which is the divine mode of administration, remain unsettled?"

"If born of water means baptized with water, then this baptism he must have, or he can never see the kingdom. But there is another view supported by the names of such men as Calvin, Lampe, Tholuck, and others, a view analogous to that which we were led to adopt of the words 'baptize with the Holy Ghost and fire,' and which, with perhaps slight modifications, regards the words as equivalent to, *born of the cleansing, purifying Spirit*. Says McCue, 'To be born of water and of the Spirit is just to be born of the Spirit purifying the soul as water does the body.' If this be a correct exposition, it gives no countenance whatever to a rite, but refers solely to the operation of the Spirit."

"The general conclusion which I derive from the foregoing is, that Christian baptism is the baptism of the Spirit; that there is no authority in the New Testament for a ritual baptism in the present dispensation; but that when Jesus said, 'Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' *He inculcated upon disciples the duty of imparting spiritual influences, of converting sinners, and building up converts in their most holy faith.*"

"But let it be fairly understood that baptism with water is not a gospel ordinance, and men may come to inquire what that baptism is which saves. Let it be given out that compliance with rites does not bring men any nearer Heaven, *and is not required by God*, and they may be stirred up to ask what is the bond that unites to the Saviour? If many should feel that with the rite they have lost their all, they have been leaning upon a broken reed, and may be led to flee for refuge even yet to the Ark of Safety—the Lord Jesus Christ."

Walter Brute, an English reformer, said: "Faith is

a spiritual water, springing from Him, the fountain of wisdom, wherein the soul of the sinner is washed from sin. With this water were the faithful patriarchs baptized before the law; and the faithful people of the Hebrews, and the faithful Christians, after the law. Many Christians are saved without the sacrament of baptism in water. Are not all baptized with the Holy Ghost, and with fire?—but not with material fire. Thus, no more is the lotion of corporeal water necessary to wash away sins, but only *spiritual water*; that is to say, *the water of faith*.”

John Saltmarsh, an eminent minister of the Church of England, published a discourse against water baptism, in which he said: “No outward ordinance nor ministration of the creature can convey or confer pure spiritual things. Also, that the baptism of water is not Christ’s baptism, or of His administration, but John’s and his ministry; and, therefore, that Christ never gave it to His disciples in their first commissions to preach to the Jews, nor baptized He any Himself, nor doth it appear that in Matthew 28:19 He meant baptism by water, but by the Spirit.”

John Bunyan, the author of “*The Pilgrim’s Progress*” (died A. D. 1688), says: “If a man cannot show himself to be a Christian without water baptism, he cannot show himself to be one by it. As for the pins and tacks of the tabernacle, they were expressly commanded, and when you have proved by the Word of God that you ought to shut the Saints out of your communion *for the want of baptism*, then you may begin, justly, to make your parallel. It rests with you to prove that baptism is the fruit of faith, *or that faith ought to be tied to take its first step in water-baptism! Go but ten doors from home, and see how many would be known by this livery that they had put on Christ.* You quite forget that text, ‘By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have LOVE ONE TO ANOTHER’ (John 13.35). By laws and ordinances you will not be saved, since you came not in by the door.”

Richard Claridge says: "Water-baptism was no ordinance of Christ, but belonged to John's ministry, and was one of those 'divers washings' mentioned in Hebrews 9:10, and is there ranked with '*carnal* ordinances, imposed until the time of reformation.' Long before John's time, not only natives, but strangers were received into covenant, not only by circumcision, but baptism: see Poole and Hammond on Matt. 3:1-12. And Hammond in his Letter of Resolution to Six Queries, says, 'The whole fabric of water-baptism is built upon this basis—*the customary baptism among the Jews.*' Now, can we think that that should be instituted for a gospel ordinance which was an old Jewish rite, and at best but a shadow or figure of a better thing to come, viz., the cleansing and purifying of the heart and conscience by the baptism of the Holy Ghost?"

"Again water-baptism was no ordinance of Christ, since Christ did not institute or command water-baptism, nor did Christ Himself baptize with water. And John, who was sent from God, testifies that while he himself baptized with water, Christ should baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire. The difference between them is thus plainly stated. And Christ Himself (Acts 1:5) repeats the distinction between them, for 'John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.' And Peter could not deny the distinction, Acts 11:16, '*Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that He said, John indeed baptized with water; BUT YE SHALL BE BAPTIZED WITH THE HOLY GHOST.*' Can anything be plainer than that the former was John's baptism and not Christ's, and the latter Christ's and not John's? This is manifest from the testimony of John, Christ, and Peter!"

"When thou citest Matt. 28:19 for water-baptism, remember that *water is not* in the text; but the HOLY GHOST IS, for the commission reads, 'Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'

To baptize into the *name*, is to baptize into the *power*, for so the word frequently signifies in the Holy Scriptures; see Psa. 9:10 and 75:1; Prov. 18:10; Isa. 25:1, and 26:8,13; Jer. 10:6; Matt. 18:20; Luke 10:17; John 1:12 and 2:23, and 20:31; Acts 3:16, and 4:10,12; and many other places. The apostles did not baptize into the bare name, consisting of so many letters and syllables, but into the power of that most glorious and excellent name, for the power of God attended their ministry. Their preaching was 'in demonstration of the Spirit and of power,' 1 Cor. 2:4. The baptism of the Spirit went along with their ministry of the Word."

Joseph Bessee, who wrote about 1730, testifies thus: "All types have ceased in point of obligation. Water-baptism was a type; therefore water-baptism has ceased in point of obligation. It is proved from the coming of the antitype, else they would be in force together. This would be equivalent to setting up the first tabernacle again, with its figures, and to justifying the Jews in their meats, and drinks, and divers baptisms, and carnal ordinances imposed on them only until the time of reformation. That water-baptism was a type is clear, in that it was a figure of that inward and spiritual washing which is only effected by the baptism of Christ. That the baptism of Christ was prefigured by John, John himself testifies when he says, 'I indeed baptize you with water, unto repentance: but He that cometh after me * * * shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire.' (Matt. 3:11,12.) So Christ testifies, 'John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.' (Acts 1:5.) And Peter bears the same witness, 'Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that He said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.' (Acts 11:16.) John's baptism with water could only purify the flesh; Christ's baptism, the antitype, purifies the heart and conscience."

"That which was not instituted by Christ is null in

point of obligation. Water-baptism was not instituted by Christ; therefore, null in point of obligation. The Great Commission (Matt. 28:19) required the apostles to be 'witnesses' of Christ's power in the Holy Ghost, in the 'ministration of the Spirit,' not in the ministration of water-baptism."

"That which Christ required in the great commission was *the preaching of the gospel*. The practice of the apostles was conformable thereto, and the consequence was, *the baptism of the Holy Ghost*. 'While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the Word.' (Acts 10:44.) The apostles preached 'in demonstration of the Spirit and of power,' as Paul saith: 'Our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and *in the Holy Ghost*.'" (1 Thess. 1:5.)

Joseph J. Gurney says: "Under the gospel dispensation the worship of God is at once simple and spiritual; it is the communion of the soul of man with his Creator, by the direct influence of the Spirit, and through the sole mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ. Consistently with this truth, all observances in worship which are of a purely ceremonial nature, all mere types and shadows, are by a general law abolished. They are at once fulfilled and abrogated by the great realities of the gospel of Christ."

"John, who lived under the law, baptized by divine authority; and Jesus Himself submitted to his baptism as part of the righteousness *which then was*. The apostles observed the rite, as they did a variety of other Jewish ceremonies, and having connected it in their practice with conversion to Christianity, they applied it even to the Gentiles. But Christ Himself, as the Institutor of the gospel dispensation, baptized not; and Paul, who to a great extent personally abstained from the use of this ceremony, declared that he had received no commission from Christ to perform it."

"Had a typical ceremony thus binding on the

church been here instituted, the analogy of the Jewish law would lead us to expect the most precise directions as to the persons who should perform it, and as to the manner, times and circumstances in which it should be performed. But no such directions are given, and Christians who admit the continued authority of the rite, are left, in reference to these particulars, in a state of irremediable doubt and dispute."

"In the meantime Christianity has a baptism of its own, of which our Lord and His apostles made frequent mention, without attaching to it the condition or accompaniment of any outward ceremony. It is that of Christ Himself, 'with the Holy Ghost and with fire;' and is productive of a new birth, by the Spirit. It is the baptism which 'now saveth us,' and which brings the 'answer of a good conscience toward God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ;' it is 'the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost.' This baptism properly agrees with the nature and character of Christianity, and coincides with that worship of God, which is 'in spirit and in truth.' Without it the sinner cannot be converted, or joined in fellowship with the church; without it, the soul of the believer can never be prepared for an entrance into Heaven. Whatsoever opinion, therefore, they may entertain respecting the ceremonial rite, *this* is the baptism on which Christians of every denomination ought chiefly to insist, and in so doing they will not fail to experience 'the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.'"

Thomas Clarkson says: "If, again, I were to make an assertion to divines, that Jesus Christ came to put an end to the ceremonious part of the Jewish law, and to the types and shadows belonging to the Jewish dispensation, they would not deny it. But baptism and the supper were both of them outward Jewish ceremonies, connected with the Jewish religion. They were both of them types and shadows, of which the antitypes and substances had been realized at the

death of Christ. And therefore a presumption arises again, that these were not intended to be continued.”

“On the subject of baptism, there is ground for argument as to the meaning of the word ‘baptize.’ This word, in consequence of its representation of a watery ceremony, is usually connected with water in our minds. But it may also very consistently be connected even with fire. Its general meaning is to purify. In this sense many understand it; and those who do, and who apply it to the great command of Jesus to His disciples, think they give a better interpretation of it than those who connect it with water; for they think it more reasonable that the apostles should have been enjoined to go into all nations, and to endeavor to purify the hearts of individuals, by the Spirit and power of their preaching, from the dross of heathen notions, and to lead them to spirituality of mind, by the inculcation of gospel principles, than to dip them under water, as an essential part of their new religion.”

“It appears, then, that there are two baptisms recorded in Scripture, the one the baptism of John, the other that of Christ; that these are distinct from one another, and that the one does not include the other. Now St. Paul speaks only of one baptism that is effectual; and St. Peter must mean the same when he speaks of the baptism that saveth. The question therefore is, which of the two baptisms, that have been mentioned, is the one effectual or saving baptism; or which of these is it that Jesus included in His great commission to the apostles when He commanded them to ‘go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.’”

“In the first place, St. Peter says it was not in these words, ‘Which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the put-

ting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.' (1 Peter 3:20,21.) The apostle states here concerning the baptism that is effectual and saving: first, that it is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, which is effected by water. He carefully puts those upon their guard to whom he writes, lest they should consider John's baptism, or that of water, to be the saving one to which he alludes; for having made a comparison between an outward salvation in an outward ark, by the outward water, with this inward salvation, by inward and spiritual water, in the inward ark of the testament, he is fearful that his reader should connect these images, and fancy that water had anything to do with this baptism. Hence he put his caution in a parenthesis, thus guarding his meaning in an extraordinary manner."

"He then shows what this baptism is, and calls it '*the answer of a good conscience toward God* by THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST.' In fact, he states it to be the baptism of Christ, which is by the Spirit; for he maintains, that he only is truly baptized whose conscience is made clear by the resurrection of Christ in his heart. But who can make the answer of such a conscience, unless the Holy Spirit shall have first purified the heart; unless the spiritual fan of Christ shall have first separated the wheat from the chaff; and unless His spiritual fire shall have consumed the latter?"

"St. Paul makes a similar declaration: 'For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.' (Galatians 3:27.) But no man, the Quakers say, merely by being dipped under water, can put on Christ, that is, can put on His life, His nature and disposition, His love, meekness and temperance, and all those virtues which should characterize a Christian. To the same purport are those other words by the same apostle: '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 like as Christ

was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.' (Rom. 6:3,4.) And again, 'buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him *through the faith of the operation of God*, who hath raised Him from the dead.' (Col. 2:12.) By these passages the apostle Paul testifies, that he alone is truly baptized who first dies unto sin, and is raised up afterwards from sin unto righteousness; or who is raised up into life with Christ; or who so feels the inward resurrection and glory of Christ in his soul, that he walks in newness of life."

William Penn (died 1718), the founder of the City of Philadelphia, and the founder and first Governor of Pennsylvania, replied to the Bishop of Cork as follows (alluding to Matt. 28:19): "The very text, duly considered, will not have it water; for that could baptize none *into* the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, for so the Greek text requires. For they that are baptized *into* the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, must be baptized of the Holy Ghost, since it is to come into their likeness and bear their image, which is *holiness*."

Again William Penn says: "Water baptism was John's, not Christ's, see Matt. 3:11; Acts 1:5. Jesus never used it, John 4:2. It was no part of Paul's commission, which if it were evangelical and of duration, it certainly would have been, 1 Cor. 1:14,15,16,17. There is but one baptism, as well as one faith, and one Lord, Eph. 4:5."

Again William Penn says in his, "*No Cross, no Crown*": "God is a Spirit, and He will be worshiped in spirit and in truth. It is not that bodily worship, nor these ceremonious services in use among you now, that will save or give acceptance with this God who is a Spirit. Stephen, that bold and constant martyr of Jesus, told the Jews when a prisoner at their bar

for disputing about the end of their beloved temple and its services, 'Solomon built Him an house. Howbeit the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands.' (Acts 7:47,48.) The martyr follows up his blow upon these apostate Jews, who were of those times the pompous, ceremonious, worldly worshippers, (ver. 51.) 'Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost : as your fathers did, so do ye.' As if he had told them, no matter for your outward temple, rites and shadowy services."

"It were to overthrow the whole Gospel dispensation and to make the coming of Christ of none effect, to render signs and figures of the nature of the Gospel, which is inward and spiritual. One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one bread and one cup of blessing ; that is the new wine by the kingdom of God, which is within."

"If it be gospel that he is not a Jew, that is one outwardly, nor that circumcision that is outward in the flesh, but he is a Jew that is one inwardly, and that is circumcision which is *of the heart*, in the Spirit and not in the letter, then unanswerably he is not a Christian that is one outwardly, nor is that baptism which is outward of the flesh, but he is a Christian that is one inwardly, and that is baptism that is of the heart, in the Spirit. It is not to be thought that the apostle meant to undervalue one observance because it is outward, and set up another *outward* observance, viz.: *water baptism*, in place of it."

Dr. J. M. Washburn well says : "When the Holy Spirit comes into the soul of the believer in a baptism which floods it with light, as the sun at noonday floods the outward world with light, the person does not have 'to read the Jewish law' to learn that such a flood of light has poured into it. But the light in the soul is its own witness. And the light is there because life from God is there. 'In Him was life ; and the life was the light of men.' (John 1:4.) And the

life of God in the soul *witnesses* its own presence. The witness of God is greater than the witness of men. And it is this witness which gives *full assurance*, and is the end of all types and shadows in the economy of grace."

Justin Martyr (died A. D. 167) said to Trypho, a Jew: "How can I require that baptism (of water) who have been baptized with the Holy Ghost? And so many righteous men who have kept none of *these legal observances* have still obtained the express approval of God Himself."

"If I were to sum all the ordinances which were commanded by Moses, I should prove them to be types and symbols. The cisterns which you (Jews) have dug out are broken and useless to you. For what use is that baptism which cleanses the flesh and the body only? Baptize the soul from anger, and from covetousness, and from envy, and from hate, and, behold, the body is pure. You, however, receive everything in a carnal sense, and think it to be serving God if you do such works, while your souls are filled with deceitfulness."

"Nor do we receive your useless baptism of cisterns, for such bears no relation to the baptism of life. You who are circumcised in the flesh require our circumcision, while we who possess this have no need of yours. This since we had been sinners, we received by means of baptism (not the fleshly, which He has oft told us is useless, but the spiritual) through the mercy of God; and *it would be good for all to receive it likewise.*"

C. W. Smith, in the *Messenger of Love*, says: "Jesus, then, *is* our *example* in the true and genuine points, or steps of Christian grace, loyalty, and obedience, but not in rites, ceremonies, and ordinances. His life ceremonially fulfilled the old covenant, and His death destroyed it. Our life must fulfill the new. Our observation justifies us in stating that those who are

most stringent for a literal following of Jesus 'down into and up out of' the water, and in like shadows, are least inclined to follow Him on the line on which Peter explicitly declares, that 'Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an *example*, that ye should follow His steps.' What are those steps? First, '*Who did no sin.*' Do we follow Him there? Second, '*Neither was guile found in His mouth.*' Are we loyal to the example in this? Third, 'Who, when He was reviled, reviled not again.' Do *we* do likewise? Fourth, 'When He suffered, He threatened not.' Do our lives agree with the pattern? Fifth, 'But committed Himself to Him that judgeth righteously.'—1 Pet. 2: 21-23. John, Jesus, and the disciples *were* Jews, bound by the Jewish law, and their baptisms were simply in compliance with that law, and hence no part of the new covenant, and of no binding force upon the new covenant children of God."

John H. Noyes, in *The Berean*, says: "Matt. 3:11, 'I [John the Baptist] *indeed baptize you with water* unto repentance: but He that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: He [Christ] *shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire.*' In each of the other Evangelists this declaration of John is recorded (Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:26) and Christ Himself repeated it just before His ascension: '*John truly baptized with water; BUT YE SHALL BE BAPTIZED WITH THE HOLY GHOST not many days hence.*'—Acts 1:5."

"Here, then, we have in the beginning of each of the first five books of the New Testament an explicit statement of 'the doctrine of baptisms;' the very doctrine, doubtless, to which Paul alluded in using the plural of the word *baptism*. The doctrine manifestly is, that *water baptism* belonged to the ministry of John, and the *baptism of the Holy Ghost* to that of Christ. These primary statements are so simple and clear that we cannot wonder that Paul regarded 'the doctrine of baptism' as one of the first principles of

the instructions of the gospel; and if on further examination we find nothing inconsistent with the view they present, we shall have no difficulty in forming our judgment on the subject."

"It is plain that all occasions for dispute about the *mode of water baptism* is removed, unless, indeed, we consider John the Baptist our spiritual head, instead of Christ. If, in professing to be Christians, we rank ourselves among the followers of Christ, and not of John, we must regard *water baptism* as an ordinance belonging to a *past* dispensation; and of course all controversy concerning it is ill-timed foolishness. We are subjects of the dispensation to which the *baptism of the Holy Ghost* belongs. We receive the substance, of which John's baptism was the shadow; and have no more occasion for dispute about water baptism than about circumcision or any other ordinance of Judaism."

Gurtleras says: "Baptism in the Holy Spirit is immersion into the pure waters of the Holy Spirit, or a rich and abundant communication of His gifts. For he on whom the Holy Spirit is poured out, is as it were, immersed into Him."

Hopkins says: "These that are baptized with the Spirit, are, as it were, plunged into that heavenly flame whose searching energy devours all their dross, tin and base alloy."

Mrs. Catherine Booth, wife of the founder of the Salvation Army, says in her book "*Popular Christianity*": "What an inveterate tendency there is in the human heart to trust in outward forms, instead of seeking the inward grace! And where this is the case, what a hindrance, rather than help, have these forms proved to the growth, nay, to the very existence, of that spiritual life which constitutes the real and only force of Christian experience."

"When I was in Ireland some of the oldest and most experienced Christians who took part in the

great revival, some twenty-five years ago, told me that a great proportion of the results of that wonderful work of God were lost in consequence of a controversy about water baptism. Do you wonder that we of the Salvation Army shrink from the possibility of such a sacrifice of the greater to the less, especially when we are backed up by the great apostle to the Gentiles thanking God that he baptized none of His early converts, and for the very same reason, namely, because they were making the ceremony a cause of controversy."

"When forms are exalted and idolized and trusted in * * * they become 'Nehustan,' as a piece of brass, or a piece of bread, or a bowl of water. As the apostle said of circumcision, when the Jew had put it in the place of righteousness, 'Neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: * * * Circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.'"—Rom. 2:28,29.

"We feel persuaded that if Paul were here, and could see the deadly consequences which have arisen from the idolatrous regard given to what are called the Sacraments of the Supper and of Baptism, he would say precisely the same with respect to them, Baptism is nothing, and the ceremony of the Lord's Supper is nothing."

Mrs. Catherine Booth died in 1890. Her last words are given as follows: "The waters are rising, but so am I. I am not going under, but over. Do not be concerned about dying; go on living well; the dying will be right."

Robert Smith, burned in 1555, said to the priest: "Show me, are we saved by water or by Christ?" "By both," answered the Catholic. "Then," continued the martyr, "the water died for our sins, and so must ye say that water hath life."

A Prussian martyr, one George Wagner, was burned at the stake, because, among other things, he ignored the belief that water baptism saves.

To the wife of the Governor of Friesland, the martyr Jacques Dosil said: "Water has no power to cleanse us from sin."

A young woman, named Elizabeth, in 1549, when asked by her persecutors, "Do you not expect salvation from baptism?" replied: "All the water in the sea cannot save me; but salvation is in Christ." She had been a nun, but afterward joined some Protestants. For her doctrine and constancy she was tortured and then drowned.

A Scottish martyr, one Patrick Hamilton, was burned by the Catholics, because, among other things, he said. "The corruption of sin remains in children after baptism; a man is not justified by works, but by faith only."

Jeremiah Leslie, in "*Christian Baptism*," says: "The blood of sprinkling, denoted the forgiveness of sin or redemption from guilt through the blood of Jesus. The baptism of water, shadowed forth the washing of regeneration, or the cleansing of man's soul from moral pollution by the baptism of the Holy Ghost."

"All these significant signs and ceremonies had their completion when Christ Jesus gave up the ghost; for the veil of the temple was rent in twain, which denoted the passing away of all sign and ceremony, and the disclosure of the substance in spirit and truth, and thus had their fulfilment in the opening of the gospel dispensation. The two former particulars, viz., the bloody sacrifices and the bloody sprinklings, had their fulfilment in the death of Christ on the cross; and the legal purification by water or water-baptism, had its fulfilment in the outpouring of the Spirit of God, or baptism of the Holy Ghost."

“The Apostle Paul, in the most unequivocal language, shows that the dispensation of typical ordinances was done away by the death of Christ, He having nailed them to His cross. Col. 2:14. If the type must go with the antitype in washing us from moral pollution, by what rule will you exclude the type from going with the antitype in the expiatory sacrifice by which we are pardoned? Is it not plain, that if water baptism (the symbol of legal purification among the Jews,) must go along with the baptism of the Holy Ghost to cleanse us from sin, the legal offerings of the same dispensation must go with the one offering of Jesus Christ to save us from guilt? Surely if the baptism of the Holy Ghost is insufficient to sanctify us without the addition of water baptism, so the blood of Jesus must be insufficient for our pardon, unless accompanied with the blood of bulls and goats.”

“To make this matter plain, we observe that the addition of water baptism is essential to constitute the baptism of the Holy Ghost, the one baptism of the gospel, or it is not. If it is, then the baptism of the Holy Ghost is not the one baptism of the gospel, where the baptism of water is wanting, and of course is not of itself a saving ordinance. If it is not, then the baptism of the Holy Ghost is the one baptism of the gospel, without the addition of water baptism. If any should yet be disposed to say that baptism is not rightly administered where either part is wanting, and therefore of no efficacy, do they not make water baptism essential to salvation?”

“One more consideration puts this part of our subject to rest. The baptism of the Holy Ghost consigns all its subjects to one body, ‘for *by one Spirit* are *we all baptized into one body.*’ (1 Cor. 12:13.) Not so with water baptism, that divides its subjects into as many bodies as there are different sects in Christendom who use it. Is that any part of the one baptism of Christ that thus divides the body? ‘Is Christ divided?’ 1 Cor. 1:13.”

V. S. Miller, in "*Denominations of the World*," publishes this: "There are two ceremonies in use among most professors of the Christian name—water baptism, and what is termed the Lord's Supper. The first of these is generally esteemed the essential means of initiation into the Church of Christ, and the latter of maintaining communion with Him. But as we have been convinced that nothing short of His redeeming power, invariably revealed, can set the soul free from the thralldom of sin, by this power alone we believe salvation to be effected. We hold that as there is one Lord and one faith (Eph. 4:5), so His baptism is one in nature and operation; that nothing short of it can make us living members of His mystical body, and that the baptism with water, administered by His fore-runner, John, belonged, as the latter confessed, to an inferior dispensation. John 3:30."

Robert Barclay, Quaker Reformer, (died 1690) says: "If water baptism was once a carnal ordinance, as the Apostle affirms it to have been (Heb. 9:10), it remains a carnal ordinance still, and if a carnal ordinance, then no necessary part of the gospel or new covenant dispensation; and if no necessary part of it, then not needful to continue, nor to be practiced by such as live and walk under this dispensation. There were some in the darkest times of popery who testified against water baptism. For one Alanus speaks of some in his time that were burnt for denying it: for they said that baptism had no efficacy, either in children or adult persons."

"John's baptism was a figure, and the figure gives way to the substance; the thing figured remains—to wit, the 'one baptism' of Christ, while the other, the baptism of John, ceaseth. That the baptism of John is ceased, many of our adversaries confess; and if water-baptism had been to continue a perpetual ordinance of Christ, He would either have practised it Himself, or commanded His apostles so to do. In John 4:2, it is declared that Christ did not practice it

Himself, and nowhere has He commanded His disciples to practice it.”

“And to make water-baptism a necessary institution of the Christian religion, which is pure and spiritual, and not carnal and ceremonial, is to derogate from the new covenant dispensation, and set up the legal rites and ceremonies of which this of baptism, or washing with water, was one, as appears from Heb. 9:10, where ‘divers baptisms’ are ranked with the ‘carnal ordinances’—for how baptism with water comes now to be a spiritual ordinance more than before, in the time of the law, doth not appear, seeing it is but water still.”

“There is but one baptism, as well as but one Lord, one faith. This one baptism, which is the baptism of Christ, is not a washing with or dipping in water, but a being baptized by the Spirit. The baptism of John was but a figure of this, and, therefore, as the figure, to give place to the substance. That there is but one baptism there needs no other proof than the words of the text Eph. 4:5, ‘one Lord, ONE FAITH, ONE BAPTISM.’ There is no baptism to continue now but the one baptism of Christ. Therefore water baptism is not to continue now because it is not the one baptism of Christ. If water baptism had been to continue a perpetual ordinance of Christ in His Church, He would either have practiced it Himself or commanded His apostles so to do. But that He preached it not the Scripture plainly affirms, John 4:2; and that He commanded His disciples to baptize with water, I could never read. If water baptism had been an ordinance of the gospel, then Paul would have been sent to administer it; but he declares positively, 1 Cor. 1:17, ‘Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel.’”

Joseph Phipps, in “*True Christian Baptism and Communion*,” says: “Spirit baptism is not connected with water baptism; nor at all dependent upon it. The baptism of the Saviour is complete in itself, without exterior form and shadow.”

“Those who advocate the continuance of water baptism plead our Saviour’s commission, Matt. 28:19; but He here makes no mention of water, nor do His words imply it; for His expressions are such as suit only His own spiritual baptism. The rituals of the Mosaic law were once of divine institution, but being only shadows of good things to come in the spiritual dispensation of the gospel, the good things themselves being come, their shadows appear to us no longer obligatory; so the extended forms of water baptism and the Supper being shadows of the good things already come under the spiritual ministration of the Saviour, are superseded thereby, and become of no more force than past rudiments of the law.”

Enoch Lewis, in “*True Christian Baptism*,” says: “Water baptism being an outward rite, and at best but a type of an inward and spiritual work, would seem in its very nature more properly to belong to the dispensation of the law, than to that of the gospel. It is in strict conformity with the ‘divers washings’ and purifications we read of in the ritual of Moses, and appears to have been administered subsequently to all who were received as proselytes into the Hebrew Church. From the Babylonish Talmud, and from the works of Maimonides and other Jewish writers, we learn that circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice, were enjoined on every male convert to the Jewish faith, and baptism and sacrifice on every female. The baptism, as described by these authors, appears to have been very similar in its mode of administration to that practiced by John and the early teachers of Christianity, who were yet in bondage to Jewish rites and ceremonies.”

“John, who came to prepare the Jews for the reception of the Messiah, administered water baptism as a symbol of the purification of heart which was necessary for each one to experience in the dispensation which was then at hand.”

“The entire agreement of this rite with the spirit of

the Mosaic institutions, justified the Jews in their use of it: and John the Baptist was explicitly directed to administer it; but this furnishes no reason for us to believe it was ever made part of the gospel. As a relic of *outward* rites, it was not in harmony with a spiritual dispensation."

"John had a clear perception of the difference between the baptism which belonged to the gospel dispensation, and that which he was sent to administer. The testimony which he bore to the spiritual character of the baptism of Christ, as contrasted with his own, is thus recorded by the Evangelists:"

"*I indeed baptize you with water* unto repentance: but HE THAT COMETH AFTER ME IS MIGHTIER THAN I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: *He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire.*" (Matt. 3:11.)

"*I indeed have baptized you with water*: but HE SHALL BAPTIZE YOU WITH THE HOLY GHOST." (Mark 1:8.)

"John answered, saying unto them all, *I indeed baptize you with water*; but one mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose: *He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire.*" (Luke 3:16.)

"And I knew Him not: but He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on Him, the same is *He which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.*" (John 1:33.)

"These declarations of John are very emphatic, and bear a strong testimony to the *nature* of the baptism referred to in the command of our Saviour to His disciples. The discourse is narrated by all the Evangelists."

James H. Moon, in "*Water Baptism*," says: "To whom can we turn with more confidence for knowledge about all baptism, ordained or intended for us, than unto John the Baptist whom we are told was

sent to administer one baptism, and unto Christ who was the author of another baptism? John says his baptism is of water, thus distinguishing it from Christ's baptism without water. They are both quoted as testifying to two dissimilar and distinct baptisms, administered at different times, one with water and the other without; neither of them intimates that these two baptisms shall ever be united, but they do both plainly intimate that they shall not be united, and that the first shall pass away, and the second remain."

"If in these gospel days we were to have been baptized in water, would not Joel have prophesied of water, as well as of Spirit? Would not our Saviour at some time have intimated that water baptism should be continued, and have given some instructions about it? And would He not have baptized His apostles in this way? Jesus exclaimed upon the cross: '*It is finished,*' and THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS WERE FULFILLED. *Christ blotted out ordinances,* and NAILED THEM TO HIS CROSS. He made no reservation of water baptism. It went with the rest."

Charles Spurgeon, the noted Baptist clergyman, said in a sermon: "'Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; and purify your hearts, ye double-minded.' This makes our holy religion such a weighty and solemn business. If it were wholly a matter of outward ordinances, we might take the child and sprinkle it, or might bring the adult and plunge him, or we might admit all to a table where they should eat and drink such consecrated materials as should save them. This would be all easy enough, and hence men cling to a religion of ceremonies; for heart-religion is troublesome, and the ungodly cannot endure it. Ritualism is the most popular religion in the world."

George Fox, Quaker Reformer, (died 1690) says in his "*Journal*:" "He (Paul) asserted in the church the one faith which Christ was the author of, and one baptism, which was of the Spirit into the one body,

and one Lord Jesus Christ, who was the spiritual baptizer, who John said should come after him. The Jews did use to take a cup, and to break bread and divide it among them in these feasts, as may be seen in the Jewish Antiquities; so the breaking of bread and drinking of wine were Jewish rites which were not to last always. They did also baptize with water, which made it not seem a strange thing to them, when John the Baptist came with his decreasing ministration of water baptism. But as to the bread and wine, after the disciples had taken it, some of them questioned whether Jesus was the Christ. For some of them said, after He was crucified, "We trusted that it had been He which should have redeemed Israel." (Luke 24:21.) And though the Corinthians had the bread and wine, and were baptized in water, the apostle told them they were reprobates if Christ were not in them, and bid them examine themselves. Christ had said before that He was the Bread of Life which came down from Heaven, and that He would come and dwell in them, which the apostles did witness fulfilled and exhorted others to seek for that which comes down from above. But the outward bread and wine and water are not from above but from below. Eat the Bread which comes down from above, which is not outward bread, and drink the cup of salvation which He gives in His kingdom, which is not outward wine. And thus there will not be a looking at the things that are seen (as outward bread and wine and water are) for, as says the apostle, 'The things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal.' (2 Cor. 4:18.) Outward bread and wine and water are from below and are visible and temporal. So the fellowship that stands in the use of bread, wine, and water, circumcision, outward temple, and things seen will have an end, but the fellowship which stands in the gospel, the power of God and which brings life and immortality to light, is eternal and will stand. The apostle told the Corinthians who were in disorder about water,

bread, and wine, that he desired to know nothing amongst them but Jesus Christ and Him crucified."

Dr. E. Griffin, a minister of the Campbellite denomination, a sect that places much stress on water baptism, says: "Others taking the opposite ground, make baptism almost everything. It is baptism, baptism, baptism, from the first of January to the last of December. Without baptism there can be, with them, no pardon, no peace, no happiness, no hope, no salvation, none of those blessings, in a word, which Christ came to bestow upon His followers. The unbaptized, which with them means the unimmersed, however ardent their piety, however unblamable their lives, however lovely their character, they are all represented as being without God, without Christ, and without hope in the world. They are regarded as being in a state of sin and condemnation, as strangers to the covenants of promise, and aliens to the commonwealth of Israel. And as long as baptism is placed on a par, or exalted above the spirit of love, and of good works, we shall minister the gentle hint that it is worthless."

The dying words of Joseph Briggins, (A. D. 1675) is recorded as follows: "There are many ways and baptisms in the world; but O, Thou pure holy, holy One, we have known Thy spiritual baptism into Christ Jesus our Lord, by whom the living water we have known and felt. O! it is exceedingly pure, by which we have been washed from all our sins."

The last words of Hayes Hamilton, (A. D. 1697) are given thus: "Them that will be satisfied with that of water, let them hold it, for my part I depend nothing upon it; I depend only upon the baptism of the Spirit. Heaven is not far from me. It is a sweet change."

Samuel M'All says that: "John Clayton being told

by a young man, in a rather off-hand way, that he was about to join the Baptist denomination, because half an hour's examination of the New Testament was enough to make any one a Baptist, quietly answered that perhaps such might be the result of *half an hour's examination*; but that a little further thought and inquiry would at least discover that *all* the proofs and reasons were not on ONE side of the question."

CITATIONS FROM VARIOUS AUTHORS.

"The spiritual baptism is that wherewith Christ daily baptizeth all who willingly receive Him."—*Piscator*.

"That which regenerates and renews the hearts of the elect."—*Chrysostom*.

"That which washeth the soul—as water doth the body."—*Calvin*.

"That which purgeth our consciences."—*Peters*.

"That which kindles zeal in our hearts."—*Phillips*.

"That which is necessary to salvation."—*Fulk*.

"That which purges our lusts and corruptions."—*Pool*.

"That which consumes the dross."—*Henry*.

"The only necessary baptism."—*Walter Brute*.

"Wherewith Christ baptizeth all that come to Him."—*Taylor*.

"Makes partakers of the adoption of the sons of God."—*Stevens*.

"That which only saves."—*Burkitt*.

"Without it there is neither right nor title to the kingdom of God."—*Clarke*.

"The burial with Christ, the resurrection with Christ, the union with Christ."—*Robert McNair*.

“Christians are ‘sealed,’ not with outward ceremonies, but with the Holy Spirit of promise.”—*John Allen*.

“The baptism of John was seen; the baptism of Christ is invisible.”—*Origen*.

“Neither hath Christ desisted from baptizing: He ever yet practiseth it, not by the ministry of the body, but by the invisible operation of His power.”—*Augustine*.

“If any man hath only received the bodily washing with water, that is outwardly seen with the eye, he hath not put on the Lord Jesus Christ.”—*Hierom*.

“But whilst I say, let the Bible answer, I say also, we are NOT TO INSULT the Bible and common sense, and to degrade the Christian religion from the glory of its spirituality to the vileness of materialism, by doubting for an instant what answer the Bible will give to the question—we take it for granted that the Bible will be found to ascribe NO POWER TO WATER TO CLEANSE THE SOUL.”—*Gerrit Smith*.

“He (Christ) calls His death a baptism, as being a purging of us all.”—*Theophylait*.

“The Saviour calls martyrdom baptism, saying, ‘Can ye drink of the cup that I drink of, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?’”—*Cyril*.

“There are some who, in striving for piety, have undergone death for Christ, in reality not in semblance, needing, for salvation, nothing of the water symbols, being baptized by their own blood.”—*Basil (died 379)*.

“But without being born again by baptism through the Spirit of God, and sealed by sanctification and made His temple, no one can partake of the heavenly blessings, although his life should be found *in other respects blameless*.”—*Didymus of Alexandria*.

“Be pure, not by *washing*, but by thinking.”—*Clemens, (died 220?)*.

“We are renewed by the regeneration of washing—we are renewed by the effusion of the Holy Spirit.”—*Ambrose, (died 397)*.

INFANT BAPTISM.

Were it not that *infant sprinkling* is a subject which often perplexes well-meaning people, we would not give it even a passing notice, for there is no command in the New Testament to baptize an infant. There is *no such thing mentioned in the New Testament* AS AN INFANT EVER HAVING BEEN baptized. It is true that while the *legal ceremony* of water baptism was enjoined upon believers, “households” were baptized, as in the case of the jailer and his house, Acts 16:33, and Lydia and her house, Acts 16:15, but nothing is said about infants being included. Nothing is said indicating that there were infants in the household. Even if the rite of baptism had been administered to infants in the above instances, it would have been before *the time of reformation*. Heb. 9:10, and so not binding now. That infants, however, were baptized by the Jews is evident from testimony that follows :

Moses Maimonides, a Jewish Rabbi and writer of the 12th Century, says : “An Israelite that takes a little heathen child (in war) or that finds an heathen infant and baptizes him for a proselyte, behold, he is a proselyte.”

Wall says : “If any proselyte who came over to the Jewish religion and was baptized in it, had any infant children, they also, at their father’s request, were circumcised and baptized, and admitted as proselytes.”

The Gemara (the Jewish Commentary) says : “Because none is made a proselyte until circumcision and baptism, and if the father be dead, at the request of the

council which consists of three men that have care of this baptism, according to the law, and the baptism of proselytes.”

Dr. Lightfoot says: “The practice of baptizing infants was a thing as well known in the Church of the Jews as ever it has been in the Christian Church.”

Because he rejected infant baptism, with other rites, Arnold was crucified, burned, and his ashes thrown into the Tiber, in 1155.

Robinson well says: “Let any man of common understanding lift his mind to the dignity and majesty of the infinitely wise and good God, and *then imagine whether it be possible* that the moral government of *His empire* CAN DEPEND UPON THE APPLICATION OF A WET SPONGE, A MOIST HAND, OR A FEW DROPS OF WATER APPLIED BY ONE FRAIL MORTAL TO THE FOREHEAD OF ANOTHER !”

“If anything good in the world *depends upon a ceremony so trifling*, and so capricious (*i. e.*, as infant baptism), *the Supreme wisdom, justice and goodness is not what pious men have been used to take it for!*”

Dr. G. A. Jacobs, an eminent clergymen of the Church of England, in his “*Christian Baptism*,” says: “Infant baptism finds no mention in the New Testament. Notwithstanding all that has been written by learned men on this subject, it remains indisputable that infant baptism is not mentioned at all in the New Testament. No instance of it is recorded there; no allusion is made to its effects; no directions are given for its administration. It ought to be distinctly acknowledged that it is not an apostolic ordinance. There is no trace of it until the last part of the second century, when a passage is found in Irenæus which may possibly—and only possibly—refer to it. Nor is it anywhere distinctly mentioned before the time of Tertullian, who, while he testified to the practice, was

himself rather opposed to it. As an established order of the church, it belongs to the Third Century, when its use and the mode of its administration, and the whole theory of it as a Christian ceremony, were necessarily moulded by the baptismal theory of the time—a circumstance which ought to be distinctly kept in view in every consideration of the subject.”

As before stated, as early as the Second Century, even so early as A. D. 140, 150, 175, the Christian Church, as history shows began to lapse back into some of the old Jewish customs, and later on the budding of Catholicism came to the front and then rapidly the Church developed into Popery. And then by the latter corrupt system, rites and ceremonies were greatly magnified and multiplied, and to this day the professing church still clings to some of them. Among these Jewish ceremonies that the Early Church took up and carried along was infant baptism.

The willingness with which some of the early Christians drifted back into Judaism, and the extent to which they carried it, is astonishing. About A. D. 200, as history shows, Irenæus adopted infant baptism from the Jews. Neander, the great German ecclesiastical historian, asserts that Cyprian (died A. D. 258) hastened water baptism to the moment of birth lest the infant die unbaptized and be lost. Others taught that baptism would be administered in Hades to subjects not baptized before death. Others still taught that the rite could be administered before birth (see Robinson). Tertullian (died between A. D. 220 and 240) declared that infants being as unclean as any, needed baptism as much as any (see Kendrick). Clement (A. D. 200) agrees with Hermas that the apostles performed in Hades the rite of baptism on the pious souls of the Old Testament (see Neander).

These were some of the beliefs that crept into the Early Church as the observance of rites and ceremonies was borrowed from Jewry, yet, then as now, there

were some who ignored these outward carnal ceremonies, and strove to worship God in spirit and in truth.

Those early leaders who brought the rites and ceremonies of Jewry into the Christian Church, and sowed the seed of Popery, or who paved the way for Catholicism, did not carry with them all of the Church. Here and there, as now, were some who would not be bewildered by the carnality and superstition of the former. From the Fourth to the Sixteenth Century infant baptism was practiced generally by those who adhered to rites and ceremonies, and after the bringing of Judaism into the Early Church the whole system of the Papacy, with its idolatrous train of rituals sprang into existence.

It is often claimed that infant baptism takes the place of circumcision, yet the Bible makes no such assertion, neither does it intimate it in the most remote way. Circumcision was a rite of the law to which males were subject but infant sprinklers apply the water to both male and female infants. Infant baptism really becomes dangerous when people depend for salvation upon the fact that water was sprinkled upon them in their childhood.

Dr. Robinson, the Baptist historian, says: "Children were so absolutely necessary to ecclesiastics that they were obliged to have them at all adventures. With an imperial child ecclesiastics subdued cities; with noble children monks built and endowed monasteries; with poor children, as Basil observes, the clergy formed choirs; and in fine, *of children necessity compelled them to form the whole Catholic Church.* How essential, then, to their schemes to fill the world with exclamations of 'Suffer little children to come unto me' (to us)! The first European rule of infant baptism was made at an irregular meeting of seven obscure men (of a province in Spain), without a knowledge of neighboring bishops, in the year 517. *They were a low, illiterate, mongrel sort of African*

Jewish Christians. Their Judaism appears in the above council by its canons, in which they regulated the feasts of the *Passover and Pentecost*, and the keeping of the (Jewish) Sabbath, and called the bishop of Carthage pope [*i. e.*, high priest].”

Irenæus (Greek bishop died about A. D. 200) says: “Infant baptism appears as the medium through which Christ imparts sanctification to infants.”

This error of the early bishop is well refuted by Olshausen, who says: “Of infant baptism the New Testament knows nothing.”

Bossuet, the learned French Catholic bishop, (died 1704) says: “Protestants assert that the baptism of infants is founded on the Scripture, but they produce no express passage to that purpose, arguing from remote, not to say doubtful, or even false premises. It is certain that all the proofs brought from the Scripture on this subject have no force at all.”

Bellarmino, a Catholic, in his work on baptism, says that in Scripture: “There is neither command nor example for infant baptism.”

John Wickliffe, the English Reformer and translator of the Bible (died 1384), says: “They who affirm that the children of the faithful dying without baptism are not saved, are blasphemous and foolish.”

William Tyndale, English Reformer and martyr (died 1536), says: “The water of the (baptismal) font hath no more virtue in it than any other water—that the water of baptism doth not take away sin. The virtue of baptism lieth not in hallowed water, or in the outward things at the font, but in faith only. Infants are holy and clean, **THOUGH THEY HAVE NOT RECEIVED BAPTISM.**”

Dr. David Simpson, the eminent Episcopal minister, in his work "*A Plea for Religion*," written in 1797, says: "I add a second circumstance which seems a hardship to the enlightened and conscientious part of the clergy. When we baptize children, we thank God 'that it hath pleased Him to regenerate them with the Holy Spirit.' When the same children are presented to the Bishop, he addresses the Divine Being as having 'vouchsafed to regenerate them by water and the Holy Ghost,' while many of them are as wild young rogues as ever existed. Then when we come to bury them, we dare do no other than send them all to Heaven, though many of those we commit to the earth have been as wicked in life as men well can be this side of Hell. What I mean to infer is, that if the doctrine of baptismal regeneration and final perseverance be true, every member of the Church of England is as sure of Heaven as if he were already there. I leave those whom it may concern to draw the natural inference."

But let us hear another Episcopal testimony. Dr. George Hodges, D. D., Dean of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass., in a work entitled, "*The Episcopal Church*," says on page 81: "Concerning infant baptism there is neither precept nor example in the New Testament."

The third and last ordinance to be considered is what is generally termed *the Lord's Supper*.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

IT IS SAID THAT "Custom makes everything proper." While that may be true in a measure, in worldly things, it is, indeed, very far from being a safe rule to apply in spiritual things.

Christians often speak of *the Lord's Supper*. If asked for an explanation, many will respond, in substance, about as follows: "Why, on the eve before the crucifixion, Jesus took bread and wine with His disciples and instituted the Lord's Supper, a memorial feast, which He declared should be kept up by us until His return for the Church."

While this is the conscientious view held by many of the Lord's children, let us see whether the Scriptures of divine truth substantiate the claim.

The term, *the Lord's Supper*, is ONLY ONCE MENTIONED IN THE BIBLE. "When ye come together therefore into one place, THIS IS NOT TO EAT THE LORD'S SUPPER."—I Cor. 11:20. It is singular, indeed, that so much stress is laid upon an expression *only once used in the Scripture*, and THEN REFERRED TO IN A REBUKE.

Jesus never made use of the term *the Lord's Supper*; at least we have no record of it. How could He institute a feast to be called *the Lord's Supper* without mentioning it?

In Luke, 22d Chap., is an account of the Last Supper. Here we find that Jesus was not celebrating or instituting an ordinance called *the Lord's Supper*; but He was observing the JEWISH PASSOVER, for which the *passover* (lamb), on the very occasion of the Last Supper partaken of by Jesus and His disciples "*must be killed*." See Luke 22:7-13. Mark 14:12, says: "*When they killed THE PASSOVER*." This

makes it very plain that the ceremony was the old Jewish Passover, in which the lamb previously slain was utilized in the observance of the ceremony.

Jesus was a Jew on His human side, and *was circumcised* like Jewish children in general, see Luke 2:21. Later on He was baptized under the law with water baptism *in order to fulfil the righteousness of the law*. See Matt. 3:15. Prior to His crucifixion He zealously kept the law, and that identical law, too, which later on His very sacrifice on Calvary virtually blotted out. Mark the Scripture proof of the fact that *Christ by His work on the cross blotted out ordinances*: "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth."—Rom. 10:4.

"Having *abolished in His flesh* the enmity, even the law of commandments *contained in ordinances*."—Eph. 2:15.

"Which stood only in *meats and drinks*, and *DIVERS WASHINGS* (Greek and German, baptisms), and *carnal ordinances*, imposed on them *UNTIL THE TIME OF REFORMATION*."—Heb. 9:10.

"*Blotting out* the handwriting of *ordinances* that was *against us*, WHICH WAS CONTRARY TO US, and *took it out of the way*, *NAILING IT TO HIS CROSS*."—Col. 2:14.

"Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, WHY, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances, (*TOUCH NOT; TASTE NOT; HANDLE NOT; Which all are to perish with the using;*) *AFTER THE COMMANDMENTS AND DOCTRINES OF MEN?*"—Col. 2:20, 21, 22. Could language be plainer? Could any statement more emphatically declare ordinances to be abolished? Could any command more fully charge us to neither "*touch,*" "*taste,*" nor "*handle*" them?

This last feast which He observed with His disciples on the night of His betrayal He Himself always called the *Passover*. In the face of this undeniable fact, how can we say that He called it *the Lord's Supper*, or that He instituted a new feast to be so named?

This Mosaic observance is not once called *the Lord's Supper* in that chapter, but *six times* is it called the PASSOVER, an ordinance instituted by God Himself, according to Biblical chronology, 1491 years before Christ's appearance as the world's Redeemer. See Exodus 12:1-27,42-48. Concerning this feast Jesus said to His disciples on that dark and sorrowful night, "With desire I have desired to eat *this Passover* (not Lord's Supper) with you before I suffer."—Luke 22:15. In the next verse He says, "I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." Surely there will be no literal eating and drinking in the kingdom of God, whether we interpret that to mean in the spiritual dispensation here now on earth, or in Heaven hereafter.

In the four Gospels, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, the event of Christ and His disciples observing this same feast is described in nearly the same language, *and not once* is it called THE LORD'S SUPPER, but *sixteen times* is it plainly called THE PASSOVER. Moreover, nothing is said about another supper, much less is a single word mentioned about Christ's instituting a new ordinance.

The religion of God's ancient people (the Jews) consisted of a routine of forms and ceremonies. The most important was the *Passover*, consisting of the Paschal lamb, with unleavened bread, bitter herbs, and the wine.

The following is taken from *Smith's Illustrated History of the Bible*, and was for that work manifestly gleaned from the Hebrew writers, evidently from *The Talmud*. This consists of two parts, the *Mishna* or text, being a collection of Jewish traditions and explanations of Scripture, and the *Gemara*, or commentary. Sometimes the name *Talmud* is restricted, especially by the Jewish writers, to the *Gemara*, or commentary. The Jews claim that these traditions were handed down from one generation to another until the Second Christian Century, when they were reduced to writing by Rabbi Jehuda, and he is recog-

nized as the collector of the existing *Mishna*. Of the *Gemara* or comments on the *Mishna*, there are two, one known as the Palestinian, commonly called the Jerusalem Talmud (3d and 5th centuries), prepared by the Rabbis of Tiberias, and the Babylonian Talmud (5th century). Both contain the same *Mishna* or text, but different *Gemaras*, or commentaries. The Babylonian Talmud is about three times as large as the other, and is more highly esteemed by the Jews :

“ ‘Then came the day of unleavened bread, *when the Passover must be killed.*’ (Luke 22:7.) The exact time appointed in the law for killing the Paschal lamb was on the 14th of Nisan (April 5), about sunset. As all leaven was scrupulously removed about noon on the 14th in preparation for the feast, it was not unnatural to call this ‘*the day,*’ or as Matthew and Mark have it, ‘*The first day of unleavened bread.*’ ”

“ ‘The head of the household, or ‘celebrant,’ began by a form of blessing ‘for the day and for the wine,’ pronounced over a cup, of which he and the others then drank. All who were present then washed their hands, this also having a special benediction. The table was then set out with the Paschal lamb, unleavened bread, bitter herbs, and the dish known as Charoseth, a sauce made of dates, figs, raisins and vinegar, and designed to commemorate the mortar of their bondage in Egypt. The celebrant first, and then the others, dipped a portion of the bitter herbs into the Charoseth and ate them.’ ”

“ ‘The dishes were then removed, and a cup of wine again brought. Then followed an interval which was allowed theoretically for the questions that might be asked by children or proselytes, who were astonished at such a strange beginning of a feast, and the cup was passed around and drank at the close of it. The dishes being brought on again, the celebrant repeated the commemorative words which opened what was strictly the Paschal Supper, and pronounced a solemn thanksgiving, followed by Psalms 113, 114. Then

came a second washing of the hands, with a short form of blessing as before, and the celebrant broke one of the two loaves or cakes of unleavened bread and gave thanks over it."

"All then took portions of the bread and dipped them, together with the bitter herbs, into the Charoseth and so ate them. After this they ate the flesh of the Paschal lamb, with bread, etc., as they liked; and after another blessing, a third cup, known especially as the 'cup of blessing,' was handed around. This was succeeded by a fourth cup, and the recital of Psalms 115, 118, followed by a prayer, and this was accordingly known as the cup of the Hallel, or of the Song."

Concerning the cups of wine used at the Passover, "*Smith's Illustrated History of the Bible*" says: "The *Mishna* strictly enjoins that there should never be less than four cups of it provided at the Paschal meal, even of the poorest Israelite. Two of them appear to be distinctly mentioned, in Luke 22:17,20. The cup of blessing was probably the latter one of these, and is generally considered to be the third of the series."

In regard to the singing at the Passover, "*Smith's Illustrated History of the Bible*" says: "The first portion, comprising Psalms 113 and 114, was sung in the early part of the meal, and the second part after the fourth cup of wine. This is supposed to have been the hymn sung by our Lord and His apostles."

Jesus said: "*The true worshippers SHALL WORSHIP THE FATHER IN SPIRIT AND IN TRUTH: FOR THE FATHER SEEKETH SUCH TO WORSHIP HIM. God is a Spirit: and they that worship Him MUST WORSHIP HIM IN SPIRIT AND IN TRUTH.*"—John 4:23,24.

In the sixth chapter of John Jesus declares: 32. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from Heaven; *but my Father giveth you the true bread from Heaven.*"

33. "For *the bread of God is HE WHICH COMETH DOWN FROM HEAVEN*, and giveth life unto the world."

35. "*I am the bread of life*: he that cometh to me SHALL NEVER HUNGER; and *he that believeth on me SHALL NEVER THIRST.*"

47. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life."

48. "*I am that bread of life.*"

50,51. "This is the bread which cometh down from Heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down from Heaven: if any man eat *of this bread*, HE SHALL LIVE FOREVER."

57. "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: *so he that eateth me [by faith], even he shall live by me.*"

63. "*It is the Spirit that quickeneth*; THE FLESH PROFITETH NOTHING: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life."

Carefully read the sixth chapter of John from the 27th verse to the 67th; also the second chapter of Colossians, from the sixth verse to the 23d.

But we return to the narrative given in Luke 22 of the celebration by Jesus of the *last SUPPER* with His disciples. Let us observe whether Luke calls it *The Lord's Supper*, or something else.

I. "Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called THE PASSOVER."

7,8. "Then came the day of unleavened bread, when *the PASSOVER [the lamb] must be killed*. And He sent Peter and John, saying, Go and prepare us *the Passover*, that we may eat."

II. "And ye shall say unto the goodman of the house, The Master saith unto thee, Where is the guest-chamber, where I shall eat *the Passover* with my disciples?"

13. "And they went, and found as He had said unto them: and they made ready *the Passover.*"

15. "And He said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat *this Passover* with you before I suffer."

Thus it is plain beyond the possibility of a doubt

that this observance was nothing more than the *Jewish Passover*. The Lord *calls it nothing else*, and SAYS NOT A WORD ABOUT ANOTHER or a new feast to be called *The Lord's Supper*. Matthew, Mark, Luke and John all testify to the same fact in similar language.

In verse 16, addressing His Jewish disciples, He says unto them: "I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God."

17. "And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves."

18-20. "For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come. And He took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto 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 in my blood, which is shed for you."

"This do in remembrance of me." How natural and fitting. The Passover had a two-fold symbolical meaning to the Jews. It pointed back to the deliverance from Egyptian bondage, and forward to Christ, the coming Messiah. How appropriate that now upon the occasion of this last observance of the Passover Supper with the disciples (His Jewish brethren) He should say unto them concerning this typical feast which pointed to Him, "This do in remembrance of me." No command is here given, nor yoke made, to be incumbent upon the Church in the future to keep up this or any other literal supper of bread and wine in the new dispensation. The Master did not command, nor even intimate, that the perpetuity of the rite should be continued through all future generations, or until His final coming for the Church, His Bride, when the dead shall be raised, and when the Saints who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air and so ever be with the Lord, as recorded in 1 Thess. 4:16,17. Yet from this account of the *Passover* our ordinance brethren draw the inference that

then and there Christ instituted a new feast, separate from *the Passover*, to be called *The Lord's Supper*; but does the language of the text declare it?

It must be observed that Christ and His disciples celebrated this feast STILL UNDER THE LAW, for He had not yet abolished the system of types by His sacrifice on the cross, much less had this abolishment actually passed into effect by the declaration of the *Time of Reformation*. Heb. 9:10, *when the whole code of rituals WAS TO GIVE WAY TO A NEW AND SPIRITUAL WORSHIP.*

Like His disciples in John 6:60, some people may be ready to say: "This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" This they said after He made the startling assertion in John 6:53, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you."

The common belief among some Christians is that this literal feast must be kept up until Christ comes for His Bride, because He, under the law and while at the Passover Supper with His Jewish disciples said: "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come."—Luke 22:18. But how can this mean His coming for the Church? since she will see Him, and in Luke 17:20,21, He says: "The kingdom of God *cometh not with observation*: Neither shall they say! Lo here! or, lo there! FOR, BEHOLD, THE KINGDOM OF GOD IS WITHIN YOU."

If the kingdom of God cometh not with observation, it is absurd and useless to seek it in the observance of rites and ceremonies.

Yes, Christian, the kingdom of God, in a sense, is within you, and you are not obliged to consume a bite of bread or a sip of wine to remind you of Christ, for He Himself, by His Spirit, now takes up His abode in the hearts of His people.

In 1 Cor. 10:16,17, ordinance advocates believe that they have ground for their observance of a literal feast of bread and wine. Let us examine it.

"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."

In John 6:56, Jesus says, "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him." This, of course, has no reference to an outward eating and drinking, and yet it is by means of the very eating and drinking which Jesus here speaks of, that the soul must have communion with God. The true communion of the body and blood of Christ, the real feasting upon Heavenly Bread is entirely inward and spiritual in the heart of those who know Jesus in the pardon of their sins, who, by the testimony of God's Word and Spirit, know that their name is written in the Lamb's Book of Life. Likewise, in as much as all true Christians partake of this one body and one blood, they too, have fellowship one with another. Therefore, Paul says in 1 Cor. 10:17, "We being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread." Who would undertake to say that he is here speaking of literal bread; "for we are all partakers of *that one bread*." Now, does Paul here mean "*that one bread*" to be Christ, or bread that some human being made? Again in 1 Cor. 10:16, he says: "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" Who will assert that bread which a man or a woman made is "the communion of the body of Christ?"

In the 21st verse he reproves them thus: "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils." Is there anything in this language to prove that "the cup of the Lord" here referred to was a literal cup of earthly wine? Does the words prove that "the Lord's table" here mentioned was a literal table with earthly bread upon it? Paul says to the Corinthians: "Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils." Does this prove that he meant the Lord's table to be a literal

table of bread and wine? The most wicked men can, and perhaps often do, partake of the outward bread, and drink from the outward cup of earthly wine, but what Christian would claim that such wicked, unsaved men could “drink the cup of the Lord” or “partake of the Lord’s table?” Paul plainly declares that they cannot, and yet if the “cup of the Lord” and “the Lord’s table” here referred to were all of the earth, earthy, then certainly the vilest of men could have partaken, in contradiction of Paul’s assertion that they could not, for an infidel could partake of literal bread and wine side by side with a Saint; but side by side with a Saint he could not sit at the Lord’s table and feast upon Him and commune with Him. No, no, this eating and drinking, the sitting at the table is only for those who have been born of the Spirit of the living God, and whose soul goes out in hungering desire for that God who is a Spirit, and who upon the emphatic testimony of Jesus “*must be worshipped in spirit and in truth.*” But even if we were to ignore this solemn truth, lay it aside, and grant ordinance worshipers their claim, that a literal table and literal bread and wine was what Paul was upholding here to the Corinthians, still this sweeping fact remains, namely, that the occurrence of the rebuke was A. D. 59, five years before Heb. 9:10, A. D. 64, when carnal ordinances are declared abolished.

Jesus says: “*I am the Bread of Life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me SHALL NEVER THIRST. I am that Bread of Life. This is the Bread which cometh down from Heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. I am the Living Bread which came down from Heaven: if any man eat of this Bread he shall live for ever. * * * Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. As the living Father has sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.*”—John 6:35,48,50,51,54,57.

Surely this is plain enough that the true eating of

His flesh and drinking of His blood are an act of faith, and not a literal eating and drinking of fleshly emblems, and that the only bread which embodies merit in this new and spiritual dispensation is the Heavenly Bread.

“*It is the Spirit that quickeneth ; the flesh profiteth nothing : the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.*”—John 6:63.

Christians who cling to rites and ceremonies maintain that in the 11th chapter of 1st Corinthians they have a foundation for their custom of observing a literal feast of bread and wine. Let us examine that foundation.

In the first place, it is very important to remember that the Corinthian feast, or supper, was observed under the law, A. D. 59, just five years before the time (Heb. 9:10) when the old code of symbols gave way to the spiritual, and manifestly Paul here refers to the same feast of bread and wine which Jesus and His disciples observed in the Jewish Passover Supper. These Corinthians, still being subject to types and shadows, was it not but natural that they should still observe this feast? Nothing, however, is ever recorded of it again, and in Heb. 9:10, A. D. 64, or five years after the observance of this feast, it is declared that “*Carnal ordinances*” were “imposed on them until the TIME OF REFORMATION.” Surely rites and ceremonies were to be supplanted by the new and spiritual dispensation after this “*time of reformation*” set in.

Concerning this feast in the 11th chapter of 1st Corinthians Paul says :

17,20. “*Now in this that I declare unto you I praise you not, that ye come together not for the better, BUT FOR THE WORSE. When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lord’s Supper.*”

This instance is the ONLY TIME the term, THE LORD’S SUPPER, is used in the Bible. Marvelous, is it not, that ordinance advocates build so much upon a term used but once in the Scriptures, and even then referred to in a rebuke.

21,22. "For in eating every one taketh before other his own supper: and one is hungry, and another is drunken. What? have ye not houses to eat and drink in? or despise ye the Church of God, and shame them that have not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise you in this? *I praise you not.*"

Surely these Corinthians who had perverted this Jewish ordinance into a riotous feast and a drunken revelry, could not have been very spiritual or discerning. Their insight into spiritual things must have been crude, and their ideas of propriety very lax. Some of them had been "*carried away unto these dumb idols.*"—1 Cor. 12:2. Paul speaks of one who, it appears, supposed he could be a Christian and "*have his father's wife.*"—1 Cor. 5:1. Yet many Christians today refer to this feast and these very people as their strong plea for their cherished feast of bread and wine. How becoming to such people is Paul's admonition to the Galatians: "This I say then, *Walk in the Spirit*, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. *But if ye be led of the Spirit, YE ARE NOT UNDER THE LAW.*"—Gal. 5:16,18.

23-26. "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto 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."

Of course, Paul here refers to *the Passover Supper*, for it is the one Jesus partook of on the night of His betrayal, and it is the only one to which Paul could have referred.

Paul, after censuring them for their carnality, tells them how Christ and His disciples observed the feast on the last occasion, which was all true and in order.

since they were still under the rites of Judaism and observing them. He does not say that he received of the Lord a commandment to keep up this ordinance through all following ages of the Church; that would have been contrary to God's mind and purpose in doing away with rites and ceremonies.

In the expression, "Till He come," did not Paul mean until Christ should come to the Israelites spiritually as the Fulfiller of all types, until the kingdom of God should come, *the time of reformation*—the change from the fleshly to the spiritual mode of worship?

On the expression "*Till He come*," our ordinance friends lay much stress, and claim that it means until Jesus comes for the Church (but the text does not say so). Moreover, it cannot be made authority for keeping up rituals after the abolishment of carnal ordinances as recorded in Heb. 9:9,10, where we read the following:

"Which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings [Greek and German, baptisms], and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation." The expression, "*Till He come*," in 1 Cor. 11:26, was made A. D. 59, and the change in the dispensations as given in Heb. 9:10 did not occur until A. D. 64, five years after. It is very important to observe this.

Does not Luke 22:18 unlock Paul's meaning of "*Till He come*?" Jesus there says: "For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come." When did it come fully to the Jewish believers? Was it not when the whole typical system gave way to the new and spiritual, as declared in Heb. 9:10?

Or, another understanding might be taken from Christ's words as recorded in Matthew and Mark. In Matt. 26:29, Jesus says: "But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that

day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." Again in Mark 14:25, He says: "Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God." These words were spoken by Jesus while at the Passover Supper with His Jewish disciples. Who would say that Jesus did not here have direct reference to a spiritual drinking, either here in spirit, in the new dispensation, or in Heaven above? We think the words bear us out in accepting either or both understandings. Surely the words, "Till He come," prove that the observance of the ceremony is not obligatory after His coming. Did not Christ give His disciples ground for believing that this coming would be a spiritual one? "Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you."—John 14:28. "I will not leave you comfortless: *I will come to you.*"—John 14:18. "If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and MAKE OUR ABODE WITH HIM."—John 14:23.

Paul declares: "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that *look for Him* shall HE APPEAR THE SECOND TIME without sin unto salvation."—Heb. 9:28. To those who looked for Him in spirit, did He not come as John testifies: "We know that the Son of God *is come*, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know Him that is true, and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life. Little children, *keep yourselves from idols.*"—1 John 5:20, 21.

Is not *the coming of Christ*, by which they were to know that they were in Him, a spiritual coming? Does not the following imply as much: "At *that day* ye shall know that I am in my Father, and *ye in me*, and *I in you.*"—John 14:20.

The true Christian to whom Christ has thus come does not need any outward, visible signs or remembrances in the way of bread and wine, any more than he needs the literal cross on his person, or before his eyes.

“ Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; *but ye see me*: because I live, *ye shall live also.*”—John 14:19. “ *Ye in me, and I in you.*”—John 14:20. Yes, praise His name, and *it is all in spirit*. Such Christians require no bread and wine to remind them of *an indwelling Christ*.

It is true that Jesus, at the Passover Supper, said to His Jewish disciples, “ This do in remembrance of me,” Luke 22:19; and it is true that Paul while the Mosaic law was still in practice said to the Corinthians, while rehearsing to them how Jesus observed *the Passover*, “ 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 shew the Lord’s death till He come.”—1 Cor. 11,25,26. But neither in the language of Christ nor Paul do we find a command that this literal eating and drinking shall be continued by all future generations in the new dispensation, even until Christ’s final, literal, visible, coming for His Bride, the Church, nor even does the language intimate such a continuation of the rite. Yet some who cling so tenaciously to their cherished feast of bread and wine virtually teach that the ordinance should be observed until Christ comes to take up His Church from earth to Heaven, when the righteous dead will be raised, and when they, together with the Saints who are then alive will be caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air.—1 Thess. 4:16,17. But neither Christ nor Paul said that the rite should be observed until that coming, and those who yet cling to these now barren emblems are simply observing symbols “ AFTER THE COMMANDMENTS AND DOCTRINES OF MEN.”

How fitting are Paul’s words right here: “ Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, *why, AS THOUGH LIVING IN THE WORLD, ARE YE SUBJECT TO ORDINANCES, (TOUCH NOT; TASTE NOT; HANDLE NOT; WHICH ALL ARE TO PERISH WITH THE USING;)* *after the commandments and doctrines of men.*”—Col.2:20,21,22.

In that great and solemn day of Christ’s final com-

ing for His Saints, when those who shall be linked to the Eternal God by faith alone in Jesus Christ will go up, may you and I, dear reader, if alive and remaining, not be found eating bread and drinking wine as a means of remembering the Lord, but may we be found "*complete in Him, WHICH IS THE HEAD OF ALL PRINCIPALITY AND POWER,*" Col. 2:10; "washed from our sins in His own blood," Rev. 1:5; may our conscience be *purged from "dead works TO SERVE THE LIVING GOD,"* Heb. 9:14; may we "*be found in Him, not having (our) own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the RIGHTEOUSNESS WHICH IS OF GOD by faith,*" Phil. 3:9; may "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness" (2 Cor. 4:6), shine in our hearts, "to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," 2 Cor. 4:6; may "the God of hope fill (us) with all joy and peace in believing, that, (we) may abound in hope, *through the power OF THE HOLY GHOST,*" Rom. 15:13; may we be found to be of those of whom Jehovah said: "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people," Jer. 31:33; and may we be among those of whom the Master may say: "thou hast been faithful over a few things * * * enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."—Matt. 25:21. Amen! so may it be.

Let us consider some plain, indisputable facts concerning this Corinthian feast:

First. It was a literal feast of bread and wine.

Second. It was a ceremonial yet under the law.

Third. The old dispensation was yet in force.

Fourth. The participants made a riotous feast of it.

Fifth. Paul rebukes them sharply for their carnality.

Sixth. Paul relates how Jesus took this supper with His Jewish disciples.

Seventh. Thus he proves the ceremony to have been the Passover, or a continuation of it.

Eighth. Being a ceremonial feast of outward emblems, it virtually became of no binding force five years later (Heb. 9:10), which says: "*Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, IMPOSED ON THEM UNTIL THE TIME OF REFORMATION.*"

Ninth. No literal eating of bread and wine *is ever again mentioned after this feast in 1 Cor. 11*, and, of course, NEVER AFTER THE ABOLISHMENT OF ORDINANCES AS DECLARED IN HEB. 9:10, just above quoted.

Tenth. The very next feast, communion or supper we find, is in Rev. 3:20. It is Christ's own and last invitation to His Church: "*Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me.*" The nature of this true and *now only* Lord's Supper is certainly so plain that no one should associate it with a feast of bread and wine.

"For the Kingdom of God IS NOT MEAT AND DRINK; BUT RIGHTEOUSNESS, AND PEACE, AND JOY IN THE HOLY GHOST. For *he that in these things serveth Christ IS ACCEPTABLE TO GOD.*"—Rom. 14:17,18.

"I am the living bread which came down from Heaven: *If any man eat of this bread, HE SHALL LIVE FOREVER. * * * It is the Spirit that quickeneth; THE FLESH PROFITETH NOTHING: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.*"—John 6:51,63.

"This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? *Are ye so foolish?* HAVING BEGUN IN THE SPIRIT, *are ye now made perfect by the flesh?*"—Gal. 3:2,3.

"Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and *be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.* If ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law. *If we live in the Spirit, LET US ALSO WALK IN THE SPIRIT.*"—Gal. 5:1,18,25.

It must be remembered that Paul kept the law, for a time, at least, and seemingly with the object of sat-

isfying some of the Jews. He even observed *the Jewish rite of purification*, Acts 21:23,24,26, and *circumcised Timothy*, "because of the Jews," Acts 16:3, before taking him along on his tour of the churches. And all this, too, after his conversion to the Christian faith.

His reason for doing this he evidently states in 1 Cor. 9:20,21,22,23. "Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; To them that are without law, as without law, * * * that I might gain them that are without law. To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak: *I am made all things to all men*, THAT I MIGHT BY ALL MEANS SAVE SOME. AND THIS I DO FOR THE GOSPEL'S SAKE."

Seemingly it was Jehovah's purpose that the Jews were to remain Jews in regard to the Mosaic rituals until the time when the people should be led from the shadow to the substance. This time is understood to be "*The time of reformation*" recorded in Heb. 9:10, which, according to Bible chronology, was A. D. 64, or thirty-one years after the crucifixion of Christ, which occurred A. D. 33. This is according to Usher's chronology, or reckoning of Bible dates, and is the recognized standard or authority on Biblical chronology.

History informs us that the ceremonial law was observed, by some at least, until the destruction of the Temple by the Roman army under Titus, A. D. 70, six years after the time of reformation. Jesus foretold its destruction, and God may have thus stripped the Israelites of their earthly tabernacle, seeing that they were unwilling to give up the typical for the new and spiritual.

The learned Dr. McNair, in his admirable work says: "In that He saith, A new covenant, *He hath made the first old*. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is READY TO VANISH AWAY. Then verily the first covenant had also *ordinances* of divine service,

and a worldly sanctuary.'—Heb. 8:13; 9:1. The natural inference from these words is, that one of the features peculiar to that covenant of which the apostle speaks as ready to vanish away was the possession of *ordinances*. The 'worldly sanctuary' connected here with these has vanished away. It has not only disappeared in its then form, but nothing like it is found in the new economy—the Gospel Church. Why, then, should it be maintained that ordinances must be left, that in some shape or other, we must have rites of initiation and ceremonial worship? If the language of the apostle implies that ritual worship was peculiar to the first covenant, and if this covenant when he wrote was ready to vanish away, surely the ritual worship must have been ready to vanish away as well, and should before now have come to an end. Christ gives us the New Testament worship, when He says (John 4:23) 'The hour cometh, *and now is*, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father *in spirit and in truth.*'"

From Mosheim, the great German ecclesiastical historian (died 1755), we learn that Jewish converts kept the Passover for two or three centuries. Indeed, it seems evident that early converts to Christianity were prone to cling to Jewish rites, and slow to accept fully the worship in spirit only of the new dispensation. Doubtless their long usage of the rites of Jewry, and their consequent attachment thereto was not readily to be overcome.

Neander, the historian, says: "As to the celebration of the Holy Supper, it continued to be connected with the common meal, in which *all members of one family joined*, as in the *primitive Jewish Church* and agreeably to its first institution. Some have endeavored to find, in 1 Cor. 5:7, a reference to a *Christian Passover*, to be celebrated in a Christian sense, with a decided reference to Christian truth, but we can find a reference only to a Jewish Passover, which was

still celebrated by the Jewish Christians. This practice of outward Judaism he (Paul) applies in a spiritualized sense to Christians. Purify yourselves from the old leaven, for Christ has been offered as our Paschal Lamb. Therefore as men purified from sin by Christ, our Paschal Lamb, let us celebrate the feast, *not after the manner of the Jews*, but so celebrate it that we may be a mass purified in heart from the leaven of sin."

Must we partake of bread and wine, a legal ceremony, claiming that it must be done as an ordinance till Christ's literal coming for His Church, in the face of the following solemn declarations of God's Word, recorded in the second chapter of Colossians, *five years after* the ordinance is mentioned for *the last time?*

6. "*As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, SO WALK YE IN HIM.*"

8. "Beware lest any man spoil you *through philosophy* and vain deceit, after the *tradition of men*, after the RUDIMENTS OF THE WORLD, and not after Christ."

10. "*And ye are complete in Him.*"

13,14. "And you, being dead in your sins, * * * hath He quickened together with Him, having forgiven you all trespasses; *Blotting out* the handwriting of ORDINANCES that was *against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross.*"

16,17. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days: *Which are a shadow of things to come; BUT THE BODY IS OF CHRIST.*"

20-22. "Wherefore *if ye be dead with Christ* FROM THE RUDIMENTS OF THE WORLD, WHY, as though living in the world, are YE subject TO ORDINANCES, (*Touch not; TASTE NOT; HANDLE NOT; Which all are to perish with the using;*) after the commandments and doctrines of men?"

"If ye then be risen with Christ, *seek those things*

which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. *Set your affections on things above*; NOT ON THINGS ON THE EARTH. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God."—Col. 3:1,2,3.

"Now *the just shall live by faith*: but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him."—Heb. 10:38.

"*It is a good thing that the heart be established with grace*; NOT WITH MEATS, *which have not profited them THAT HAVE BEEN OCCUPIED THEREIN*. We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat *which serve the tabernacle*."—Heb. 13:9,10.

Some more zealous for the bread and wine than others, take it every Sunday, or Sabbath, or every "first day of the week," or Lord's Day, as others prefer to name the day. If asked for their authority for this they may refer to Acts 20:7: "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them." *Nothing is said about wine in the chapter*. How absurd it is to force an ordinance feast of bread and wine into a text that gives no room for it, and positively makes no mention or reference to it. The text gives no authority even to say that it was the Passover.

Acts 2:42, says: "And they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." Why should we understand this to be other than an ordinary eating? Surely nothing to the contrary is proven by the context. They "had all things common; And sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need. And they, continuing daily with one accord *in the temple*, and breaking bread *from house to house*, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart."—Acts 2:44-46. So it seemingly was the custom, since they had all things common, to *break bread and eat meat from house to house*. Of this custom of a daily eating from house to house among those who "had all things common," can we make an ordinance for the church?

The act of bread-breaking is mentioned in the New Testament in passages having no reference to an ordinance. See Matt. 14:19; Mark 6:41; Luke 24:30.

In regard to the breaking of bread, we find no command in the above scriptures to make an ordinance of it now. Nor does the language of these scriptures referring to it say, or even intimate that the breaking of bread was a ceremony of religious significance even in that day. But, supposing that the language of the texts which mention the breaking of bread plainly stated that the custom was an ordinance, yet this undeniable fact remains, that it was done A. D. 32, 33, or 31 and 32 years before the time of reformation, A. D. 64, when ordinances were declared to be void. See Heb. 9:10.

Acts 20:7, says: "Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow, and continued his speech until midnight." Nothing here states that this eating was ceremonial. Then in the 11th verse we read: "When he therefore was come up again, and had broken bread, and eaten, and talked a long while, even till break of day, so he departed." This mention of two different times breaking bread occurred at the same meeting, and was evidently not a religious ceremony, but simply an eating for bodily refreshment.

The time spent at this meeting was from one day until the morning of the following day. The expression "when he therefore *come up again*," refers to Paul coming up from below, where he had gone to a young man who, while asleep in the meeting, had fallen down below from a third loft window. The young man had "fallen into a deep sleep," as "Paul was long preaching," and the young man "sunk down with sleep, and fell down from the third loft." See Acts 20:9.

On the wilderness march the Israelites ignored faith, while Moses was absent, and made a calf to worship—a god that they could *see and handle*. Just so do

some of the ordinance people, *by their clinging to dead rites*, IGNORE THE COMPLETENESS THERE IS IN CHRIST ALONE. Some of them just as really make a god out of bread and wine as the Israelites did of the calf.

It is these outward things, these *non-essentials*, that divide Christians and make sects, not spiritual things. There is no danger of believers in our Lord Jesus Christ splitting about God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit, but about a bite of bread and a sip of wine, or the mode of a useless water baptism, they will divide into scores of factions, and manifest one toward the other a spirit that Satan must be well pleased with.

This grasping at outward observances often follows the absence of spiritual life and power, and is the old error of turning from God's fountains of living water to broken cisterns which can hold no water. If there is in this spiritual dispensation any life to be derived from these abolished and now barren ordinances, surely the people who still observe them should be the most spiritual. But alas! that is no more the case than that we are now in the millennium.

"But in vain they do worship me, TEACHING FOR DOCTRINES THE COMMANDMENTS OF MEN."—Matt. 15:9.

In I Cor. 5:6,7,8, we read: "Your glorying is not good . . . Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump . . . For even Christ *our Passover* is sacrificed for us: Therefore let us keep the feast, *not with old leaven*, . . . but with the unleavened BREAD OF SINCERITY AND TRUTH."

Jesus Himself, the *true Passover*—the last Lamb slain, Him whom the bread and wine symbolized, is what we now *feast upon by faith*. Remember the words: "I AM THAT BREAD OF LIFE."

But there is a Lord's Supper in these last days of the Church's Laodicean state, and partaking of that, we need no bread made by the hands of women, or wine pressed out of grapes, to remind us of that gracious Jesus who says: "*Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the*

door, I will come in to him, AND WILL SUP WITH HIM, AND HE WITH ME."—Rev. 3:20.

That Christ's baptism is spiritual cannot be denied, and just as true is it that the true Lord's Supper is inward and spiritual, and not carnal or elementary. Does not the real, spiritual-minded Christian know Christ to have come by the enlightening and quickening life he realizes in the soul? Such believers require no visible, tangible emblems and ceremonies to remind them of a living, indwelling Christ. The soul cannot be fed by material bread and wine, nothing outward or tangible can nourish the spirit, "*but he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit.*"—1 Cor. 6:17.

Ritualists often quote 1 Cor. 11:2: "Keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you," which they infer means the Lord's Supper.

In that charge not a word is said about a supper or feast. The original of the word *ordinances* here, and as given in the margin, is *traditions*. Now what is a tradition? Certainly not necessarily bread and wine and water, but instructions, or historical matter, handed down from one generation to another.

In favor of rituals some may quote the case of Zacharias and his wife, who "were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless."—Luke 1:6.

But be it remembered that they were Israelites, *living under the law*, and strictly observing it, looking for the coming of the long-promised Messiah. Moreover Zacharias was one who "*executed the priest's office* before God in the order of his course, *According to the custom of the priest's office*, his lot was TO BURN INCENSE when he went into the temple."—Luke 1:8,9. So it is plain that in his observance of these Jewish ordinances he was simply keeping the Mosaic code of ceremonies which we, as believers, *free in Christ*, have nothing to do with.

Let us turn from all preconceived belief and traditional ideas and honestly and humbly consider the following Scriptures. If we are earnest, humble seek-

ers after truth, and desire to meekly follow the Lord, we will not be left in darkness, ever remembering that “*the meek* will HE GUIDE IN JUDGMENT: and the *meek* will HE TEACH HIS WAY.”—Psa. 25:9.

“The law was given by Moses, but *grace and truth* came by Jesus Christ.”—John 1:17.

“Now we are delivered from the law, . . . that we should serve *in newness of spirit*, and NOT IN THE OLDNESS OF THE LETTER.”—Rom. 7:6.

“For *Christ* is THE END OF THE LAW for righteousness to every one that believeth.”—Rom. 10:4.

“*Having abolished* in His flesh the enmity, *even the law of commandments* CONTAINED IN ORDINANCES.”—Eph. 2:15.

“Which stood *only in meats and drinks, and divers washings* (Greek and German baptisms), and CARNAL ORDINANCES, imposed on them until *the time of reformation*.”—Heb. 9:10.

“Are ye *so foolish?* having begun in the Spirit, ARE YE NOW MADE PERFECT BY THE FLESH? * * * Now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again *to the weak and beggarly elements*, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?”—Gal. 3:3; 4:9.

To prove that the Gentiles only were relieved from the Mosaic system nineteen years after Christ, see Acts 15:5,6,10,19,24,28,29,31, which reads as follows:

5,6. “But there rose up *certain of the sect of the Pharisees* which believed; saying, That it was needful *to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses*. And the apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter.”

10. “Now therefore why tempt ye God, *to put a yoke upon the neck* of the disciples, WHICH NEITHER OUR FATHERS NOR WE WERE ABLE TO BEAR?”

19. “Wherefore my sentence is, *that we trouble not them*, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God.”

24. “Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us *have troubled you with words*,

SUBVERTING YOUR souls, *saying, Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law*: to whom we gave NO SUCH COMMANDMENT."

28,29. "For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden *than these necessary things*; That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well."

31. "*Which when they had read, THEY REJOICED FOR THE CONSOLATION.*"

To prove that the Jews were still keeping the law twenty-seven years after Christ, read Acts 21:19-24, which reads thus:

"And when he had saluted them, he declared particularly what things God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry. And when they heard it, they glorified the Lord, and said unto him, Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of *Jews there are which believe*; AND THEY ARE ALL ZEALOUS OF THE LAW. And they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs. What is it therefore? the multitude must needs come together: for they will hear that thou art come. Do therefore this that we say to thee: We have four men which have a vow on them; Them take, *and purify thyself with them*, and be at charges with them, that they may *shave their heads*: and all may know that these things, whereof they were informed concerning thee, are nothing; *but that thou thyself also walkest orderly, and keepest the law.*"

Could language possibly be plainer stating that *the Jewish believers were not freed from the law at this time*, which was twenty-seven years after Calvary? Now read the 25th verse of this same chapter, and see if it could state more conclusively that *the Gentiles were not to keep this very same law* which, in the verses immediately above it, the Jews were observing.

25. "As touching *the Gentiles* which believe, *we have written and concluded* THAT THEY OBSERVE NO SUCH THING."

That in God's mind and purpose there should be this distinction between Jew and Gentile for the time being is probably one of the things which Jesus meant when He said to His disciples: "I have yet many things to say unto you, *but ye cannot bear them now*. Howbeit *when He, the Spirit of truth, is come*, HE WILL GUIDE YOU INTO ALL TRUTH."—John 16:12,13.

Let us consult Hebrews 7th, which shows that the old covenant with all its earthly symbols, all its fleshly rites and ordinances, was forever put away, and that nothing carnal or symbolical is now needed to come between the believer and Christ.

12,13. "For the priesthood *being changed*, there is made of necessity *a change also of the law*. For He of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which *no man* gave attendance at the altar."

16. "Who is made, not after the law of *a carnal commandment*, but after the POWER OF AN ENDLESS LIFE."

19. "For *the law made nothing perfect*, BUT THE BRINGING IN OF A BETTER HOPE DID; BY THE WHICH WE DRAW NIGH UNTO GOD."

Again in Hebrews 8th we find this: 7. "For *if that first covenant had been faultless*, THEN SHOULD NO PLACE HAVE BEEN SOUGHT FOR THE SECOND."

10. "For *this is the covenant* that I will make with the house of Israel AFTER THOSE DAYS, saith the Lord; I will put my laws *into their mind*, and WRITE THEM IN THEIR HEARTS: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people."

13. "In that He saith, *A new covenant*, HE HATH MADE THE FIRST OLD. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old *is ready to vanish away*."

The 9th chapter of the Hebrews continues thus:

1. "Then verily *the first covenant had also ordinances* of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary." 10. "Which stood *only in meats and drinks, and divers washings* (Greek and German, baptisms), and *carnal*

ordinances, IMPOSED ON THEM UNTIL THE TIME OF REFORMATION.”

14. “How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, *purge your conscience from dead works* TO SERVE THE LIVING GOD?” 16,17. “For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force *after men are dead*: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth.”

“But this man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins *for ever*, sat down on the right hand of God. *For by one offering* He hath PERFECTED FOREVER them that are sanctified.”—Heb. 10:12,14.

“Let us go forth therefore *unto Him* WITHOUT THE CAMP, BEARING HIS REPROACH. By Him therefore let us offer *the sacrifice of praise to God* continually, that is, *the fruit of our lips* GIVING THANKS TO HIS NAME.”—Heb. 13:13,15.

“*But as then* he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, *even so it is now*. Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, *and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage*. But IF YE BE LED OF THE SPIRIT, YE ARE NOT UNDER THE LAW.”—Gal. 4:29; 5:1,18.

“And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. And he kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this, he fell asleep.”—Acts 7:59,60.

The question may well be asked, “Who murdered this man of God, and why was it done?” *The Jews committed the crime*, and it was done because, as they said, “This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words *against this holy place, and the law*: For we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall *change the customs which Moses delivered us*.”—Acts 6:13,14.

Yes, Stephen suffered martyrdom because he taught

the people that the religion which had consisted in the rites and shadows of the Mosaic dispensation must give way to the new and spiritual, in which God must be worshiped in spirit, and not through carnal types. He said to his murderers: "Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, *ye do always resist the Holy Ghost*: as your fathers did, so do ye. When they heard these things, they were cut to the heart, and they gnashed on him with their teeth."—Acts 7: 51, 54.

Yes, and human nature—the carnal man—is still the same to-day. How true is it that "*the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God*: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."—I Cor. 2:14.

The great complaint against Paul was, "This fellow persuadeth men to worship God *contrary to the law*."—Acts 18:13.

At the deathbed of our mother we had an opportunity of seeing how useless earthly ordinances are in the estimation of a soul about entering Eternity.

A few hours before she died, and when death had already made inroads upon the frail tenement, we sat by her side and talked of the change to take place. She was calm and reconciled throughout, and when we suggested that the end was near, she expressed her satisfaction, adding that if we had anything to request, to do so.

Asking if reason was unclouded, and getting an answer in the affirmative, we ventured to say: "Well, in health and strength you laid aside water baptism; do you want it now?" "*It is not necessary!*" was the prompt reply. "In health you put away the bread and wine," we continued; "do you want it now?" "*It is not necessary!*" was the response. "But," she continued, as the tongue was fast becoming paralyzed in death, "put this text on my tombstone; it may cause people to read the Bible:

JOHN 3:16.

‘FOR GOD SO LOVED THE WORLD, that He gave His only-begotten Son, that WHOSOEVER *believeth in Him* SHOULD NOT PERISH, BUT HAVE EVER-LASTING LIFE.’

and ROM. 10:10.

‘For *with the heart man believeth unto righteousness*; and with the mouth *confession is made* UNTO SALVATION.’”

During the last illness of Sir Matthew Hale, Lord Chief Justice of England, and author of various legal and religious works who died in 1676, some of his attendants proposed to administer the ordinance of the bread and wine to him, but he replied (*and it is given as his last words*):

“NO, MY HEAVENLY FATHER HAS PREPARED A FEAST FOR ME; I WILL GO TO MY FATHER’S HOUSE TO PARTAKE OF IT.”

The dying words of Thomas Brown (A. D. 1757) are given as follows: “People may have a regular outside, and be diligent in attending meetings, and yet know little or nothing of true religion; formality and externals are nothings; religion is an internal subject, subsisting between Christ and the soul.”

The last words of Lucy Chopping (A. D. 1705) are recorded thus: “I want nothing; the Lord is with me and His Spirit comforts me. I have bread to eat which the world knows nothing of, and the wine of His kingdom refresheth me.”

The closing testimony of Ruth Middleton (A. D. 1701) was: “Lord Jesus, feed me daily with the bread that comes down from Heaven.”

William B. Orvis, the eminent Baptist minister, in his work, “*Ritualism Dethroned*,” says: “To this ex-

pose of the origin and meaning of the *pascha* and *agapæ* of the Early Church agree the words of Christ: 'With desire I have desired (*i. e.*, with great longings I have desired) to eat this PASSOVER with you before I suffer: For I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.' (Luke 22:15,16.)

"Now what is there in these words that sounds like teaching that the Passover was then and there fulfilled, in the middle of that feast, and that a new feast was instituted before that feast concluded? Not the shadow of a hint in that direction. We do not forget that Matthew [26:26] says, '*As they were eating*, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it,' etc.; but that is precisely the way a feast is *continued* or prolonged, for the occasion at least, and not the way to end it and establish a new one! Moses, in establishing the Passover, was not thus indefinite. Christ says, 'I will not any more eat thereof (*i. e.*, of the Passover), until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.' [Luke 22:16] As much as to say, I will then drink the new wine of the gospel kingdom with you, and I will give to you the heavenly manna, and ye shall sup with me and I with you in the coming kingdom. To this also agree the 28th to 30th verse [Luke 22], as soon we may see."

"That this kingdom of God is the kingdom about to appear in glory on the earth, the 18th verse [Luke 22] fully establishes. 'For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come.' Now this form of phrase is never used to designate the passing away of all earthly things, and the transplanting of the whole Church in the upper kingdom—that is termed Christ's coming to take His Saints to Himself, that they may see His glory there."

"And let the Christian reader, bewildered by Episcopacy, Popery, Judaism, or any other sacramentarian or ritualistic fantasy, see, in language that cannot be gainsayed—carrying demonstration at every point—the fact that so far as the Lord's Supper was observed

at all by these Christians, it was simply observing the Jewish Passover—called by that name. He that cannot see in this simply the Jewish Passover perpetuated, and thereby what is termed the *Lord's Supper*, it seems cannot see what is palpable in its very face.”

“But all promises of supping with Christ, drinking the wine new with Him, etc., refer to the fulness of Christ received by His Saints here—else you take away the Christian's militant kingdom. Hence when Christ says, [Luke 22] 28th to 30th verse: ‘Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations. And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.’ Now the table is to be as literal and external as the thrones, and no more so, and none interpret the thrones as external, but spiritual.”

“Love and fellowship have been everywhere sacrificed to the *sacrament* and the *form*, however much every age and nation has differed as to what the form should be. Germany was at one time about depopulated by a bloody war for churches and sacraments. And every nation where Christ has been named has stained its soil by the bloodshed and martyrdom of its truest Saints for this cause supremely. Did Jesus Christ come to send a sword among his followers for such causes? Ah, when shall the churches be truly *Protestantized* and re-formed from the whole ritual idolatry of Judaism, Heathenism, and the Papacy? Who will arise to strike down with a mighty arm this illusive idolatry of ceremonies and sacraments? Who, in Christ's name, will enter the lists to lift the real New Testament baptism from its degradation and subsidized vassalage to a mere formal worship? to sect and schism? and to profitless externals? while the true Anointing, the Spirit of life from God, is eschewed? Who will call all churches from their worthless clamor about the Lord's table, to that true supping to which Christ invites us?”

“ Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?—[Acts 15:10.] It is truly a marvel that amid all the radical investigations of principles and learned discussions of the present day, this subject is left untouched! and no one has arisen thoroughly armed and qualified to tear away the veil of darkness that seems to rest upon the great mass of nominal Christians, in respect to what are commonly termed the *Ordinances of the Gospel!* Is it not most manifest that not only blindness in part is happened to Israel, but that this blindness is also of long continuance? and that, in consequence, a large proportion of the nominal Church of Christ is held in bondage to rituals and forms? and that by this portion of the Church the type is preferred to the antitype—the shadow to the substance?”

“ That the ordinances, as they are termed, viz., Baptism and the Eucharist, have been prolific sources of heresy, dissension, and schism, from the days of the apostles until now, no one acquainted with the history of the church will deny.”

“ Revivals of religion are impeded, and succeeded by wars about baptism and terms of communion, and ever and anon new sects are arising which make these their watchword,—the ground of their separate organization, and the basis of their hope of Heaven! Aye, in most Protestant sects they are made tests of Christian fellowship, boundaries of Christian charity and confidence.”

“ Ah, how many will superstitiously wear their long faces, and put on their *holy airs* around the communion table, or at the baptismal altar, while the weightier matters of the law—to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God, are left out of the account in their daily life. They will harp upon the subject of baptism to the day of their death, and will come around the communion table as oft as it is spread before them, as a very important and solemn duty, and yet take no pains to learn the claims of

God and the way of holiness at other times or in other ways. Now, all this we regard as superstition, mockery, idolatry—a perfect abomination in the sight of God, and ruinous to the temporal and eternal interests of men.”

““*Having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances*; for to make in Himself of twain one new man, so making peace.’ [Eph. 2:15.] Allow me to turn your attention for a moment to the incongruity of mingling types with anti-types—the shadow with the substance; aye, the dark shadows of the ceremonial law—shadows which *characterized* the former dispensation—with the glorious effulgence that beams forth from the new dispensation. By universal admission, ordinances are symbols—*i. e.*, emblems or types of other things.”

“Men talk about the ordinances of the gospel,—its positive institutions,—as though the gospel had established some *new* positive institutions. There was a ceremonial law under the Mosaic economy distinctly marked; yea, most accurately and laboriously defined; but Jesus Christ abolished it in His death: ‘having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances;’ and it were preposterous to suppose He would go directly and establish another ceremonial law; for this would be no gain. It would only secure the recurrence and perpetuity of the same evils complained of before. And how hard is it for mankind to possess themselves fully of the idea that, in respect to outward things, under the gospel dispensation, nothing is law but that which is evidently required by the *law of love!*”

“No one will pretend that any of the modes of worship, or of giving religious instruction, are *sacred ordinances* in the sense in which that term is ordinarily used. Hence, there are few or no dissensions arising concerning them. But you clothe any ritual, or ceremonial, or mode of worship with the investiture of sacredness, and if that ritual, etc., be not most accurately defined, there will be no end to the bigotry

and superstition, the hair-splitting and stupid idolatry connected therewith. And this is certainly one objection to the supposition of a New Testament ceremonial law. If there be one, it is so undefined as to leave room for all these vagaries, and for a thousand and one notions and caprices concerning it."

"There is no possible evidence from aught that Jesus Christ did or said that He understood the purport of His last Passover feast with His disciples as anything more than His final celebration of that Passover with them. There is no evidence that any new feast or sacrament was instituted there. Every part of the ceremony was after the form of the Jewish Passover festival. Jesus Christ *announced it as the Passover*, before He celebrated it, in His instructions to His disciples, etc., and *nowhere does He call it by any other name.*"

"Paul's language in 1 Cor. 11:20-34, we admit, seems much more like recognizing the establishment of an ordinance than anything recorded of the sayings of Jesus Christ upon the subject; but it is most manifestly Paul's intention only to recapitulate the teachings of Jesus Christ on the subject, in which we have seen there was nothing that even looked like a command, or the institution of a new ritual. Moreover, a close analysis of Paul's language, here and elsewhere, shows that the rite was not observed as in modern times—but that a full meal was eaten, as in the Jewish Passover, or as in their feasts of charity, celebrated from house to house—and the whole scope and aim of the apostle appears to be to remonstrate against a gross and sensual observance of those feasts, or of the Passover. Thus did Paul to the Jews, become a Jew, and to the Romans, a Roman, telling first the Jews that Christ, our Passover, is slain for us (1 Cor. 5:7), that they should therefore purge out the old leaven, and be a new lump, leavened with the grace of God."

"And now, we ask, is it not remarkable, if Jesus Christ intended to leave an affectionate, loving

memento of His sufferings and death, to be symbolized as sacred through all future ages, that the beloved disciple John—who dwells far more extensively upon the concluding scenes of our Saviour's life, as though He, of all others, would certainly have them memorialized,—says not one word about any instituted supper, but mentions simply, as a matter of history, His going to the Passover, His washing the disciples' feet—and then records His last sayings—His inimitable prayer, etc.?"

"Is not this an evidence that the reason Paul notices it was to turn the disciples away from Judaism, which they were, in that very observance, still clinging to, and urging them in *all* they did to remember Christ, and to be proved worthy of Him, lest they eat and drink damnation to their own souls? And does not Christ, in the sixth chapter of John's Gospel tell us what the true supper is? And so also in Rev. 3:20, and Paul, in 1 Cor. 5, quoted above?"

"And we talk about union and fellowship, as though fellowship in a sacrament were true fellowship, forgetting that it may be but the merest emptiness, hollow-heartedness and mockery, after all. Is the ritual fellowship of Papists or High Church Protestants worth anything? What is a sacrament that touches the body, or which, we *physically* observe, to the spiritual baptism (of love) and the spiritual bread (Christ) which we eat when we come into spiritual union with Christ, and all the Saints? How oft does the sacrament eater (or baptizer) befool himself with a conceit of his extra and exclusive righteousness, *thereby* attained and manifested, while he sets at naught Christ's true spiritual followers."

"Rites and ordinances will not characterize the Millennium, as whoever lives to that day will surely learn. The substance will supplant the shadow then. They will neither be Baptists nor Pedobaptists then; *isms* will be unknown, and Christ will be all in all. *By one Spirit* all Saints will be *baptized into one body.* (1 Cor. 12:13.) The ministration of death will then

have utterly passed away, and the ministration of the Spirit will be completely triumphant and universal."

"In the life of Gregory the Great, it is related that a certain woman, when he gave her the eucharist with the words, the body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul, laughed at the form, and when asked the reason, she replied, because he called that the body of Christ, which she knew to be bread that she had made with her own hands a little while before."

Thomas Evans, in "*A Concise Account*," says: "As there is one Lord and one faith, so there is but one baptism, of which the water baptism of John was a figure. Respecting the communion of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Society of Friends believes that it is inward and spiritual—a real participation of His divine nature through faith in Him and obedience to the power of the Holy Ghost, by which the soul is enabled, daily, to feed upon the flesh and blood of our crucified and risen Lord, and is thus nourished and strengthened. Of this spiritual communion the breaking of bread and drinking of wine by our Savior with His disciples was figurative, being that set forth in Revelation (3:20): '*Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I WILL COME IN TO HIM, AND WILL SUP WITH HIM, AND HE WITH ME.*'"

Green and Wells, in "*The Millennial Church*," say: "The many different opinions and jarring contentions that have long existed among professors of Christianity, concerning these two ceremonies, are so many evidences that their most strenuous votaries have fixed their views on mere shadows and signs, instead of embracing the real spirit and substance of Divine life to which they alluded. The great importance which has long been attached to the external performance of these ceremonies, and the ages of contention which have darkened and bewildered the world on these subjects, first originated in anti-Christian darkness,

after the Church had lost the knowledge of the true work of God. The violent contentions among Christian professors of former ages upon this subject, instead of promoting brotherly kindness, Christian charity, and heavenly love, often led to cruel hatred, blood, and slaughter; no rational Christian can suppose that Christ would establish an institution to produce wrath and strife, and that, too, among Christians."

William Farel, of Switzerland, on a poster, in 1535, said: "In the first place, every believing Christian ought to be very certain that our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, the great Bishop and Pastor, ordained of God, has given His body and soul, His life and blood, for our sanctification *by a perfect sacrifice*. To renounce this sacrifice as if it were insufficient, to replace it *by a visible sacrifice*, namely, the Mass, as if Christ had not fully satisfied for us the justice of His Father, and as if He were not the Saviour and Mediator, would be a terrible and damnable heresy."

"Yes, by the great and admirable sacrifice of Jesus Christ all outward and visible sacrifice is abolished. Christ, says the Epistle to the Hebrews (which I entreat everybody to read diligently), *'was once offered. By one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.'* Christ offered *once* and not *often*. . . . If the sacrifice is perfect, why should it be repeated? Come forward then, ye priests, and answer if ye can!"

Bergner (died A. D. 1088), says: "Christ does not descend from Heaven, but the hearts of the faithful ascend devotionally to Him in Heaven. The true, the imperishable body of Christ, is eaten only by the true members of Christ in a spiritual manner. 'Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet henceforth know we Him no more.'"

Œcolampadius, German Reformer (died A. D. 1531), says: "Christ, who said to the people of

Capernaum, 'The flesh profiteth nothing,' rejected by these very words the oral manducation, or chewing, of His body; therefore He did not establish it. There is danger in attributing too much to mere matter; since we have the spiritual eating, what need of the bodily one?"

Zwingli, Reformer (died A. D. 1531), says: "Jesus says that to eat His flesh corporeally profiteth nothing, whence it would result that if outwardly eaten, He had given us in the supper a thing that would be useless to us. The soul is fed with the Spirit, and not with the flesh."

"*The Acts and Monuments*," speaking of John Wickliff's work of reformation, which is given as A. D. 1372, says: "The world, leaving and forsaking the lively power of God's spiritual Word and doctrine, was altogether led and blinded with outward ceremonies and human traditions."

Mrs. Catherine Booth, wife of the founder and leader of the Salvation Army, of London, England, says in her book, "*Popular Christianity*:" "It is a calamity deeply to be deplored that men should thus put the form in the place of the power, but they have always been doing so. It is only another species of that idolatry which has prevailed from the foundation of the world."

"Christians often say to me, when I put this view before them, 'Oh, but you have no authority to remit the Supper, because the Lord said we were to take it in remembrance of Him till He come!' I answer that He left the taking of it at all perfectly discretionary; and as to its continuance, that entirely depends on which coming He alluded to."

"Friends, and many others of the most spiritual and deeply taught Christians of all times, have believed that He then referred to His coming at the end of the Jewish dispensation."

P. Martyr, in his disputations at Oxford, England, A. D. 1549 to 1542, said: "Cyprian saith, 'The eating of Christ is our abiding in Him.'"

Elizabeth Stamford, about A. D. 1517, said to her Catholic examiners at London: "Christ feedeth and nourisheth His Church with His own precious body, that is the Bread of Life coming down from Heaven. This is the worthy Word that is worthily received and joined unto man to be in one body with Him. Sooth it is that they be both one, that they may not be parted. This is the wisely deeming of the holy sacrament, Christ's own body; this is not received by chewing of teeth, but by hearing of ears and understanding with your soul, and wisely working thereafter."

Claudius Monerius, a Frenchman, burned at Lyons, A. D. 1551, being asked, "What believe you of the sacrament? Is the body of Christ in the bread or no?" replied: "I worship Jesus Christ in Heaven, sitting at the right hand of God the Father."

John Lambert, burned in 1538, addressed the following to the King of England: "This eating and drinking is nothing but such true faith and belief as is showed. Wherefore as Christ saith, 'Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life,' even so doth He say, 'He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.' And St. Augustine, agreeable to the same, treating upon John, doth say, 'Why dost thou prepare thy teeth and belly?' Believe and thou hast eaten. It is good to establish the heart with grace, and not with meats. And St. Augustine, assenting to the same, doth say in a sermon, 'This is not the bread which goeth into the body, but that bread which doth satisfy the substance of our soul. He who eateth inwardly in spirit, not outwardly; he that eateth in heart, and not he who cheweth with teeth.'"

Roger Coe, an aged British martyr, burned in 1555, said to his cruel enemies: "Our Lord said, 'My flesh

is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him;’ *and the bread and wine doth not so.*”

John Frith, an Englishman, martyred in 1533, said: “The ancient fathers before Christ never believed in the gross and carnal eating of Christ’s body, yet notwithstanding they did eat Him spiritually and were saved, as Adam, Abraham, Moses, etc., all of whom ate the body of Christ and drank His blood as we do. But this eating and drinking was spiritual, pertaining only to faith, and not to the teeth. They were all ‘under the cloud’ and drank of the Rock which followed them; ‘that Rock was Christ.’ Moses also prefigured Him by divers means, both by the manna which came down from Heaven and also by the water which issued out of the rock. Nor is it to be doubted that the manna and the water had a prophetic *mystery in them.*”

Mrs. Prest, an English martyr, burned in 1558, said before giving up her life: “If denying to worship that breadly god be my martyrdom, I will suffer it with all my heart. It is nothing but very bread and wine; and you ought to be ashamed to say that a piece of bread, which ferments and molds, and which may be eaten by mice or burnt in the fire, is changed into the body of Christ.”

The Catholic dignitary in 1549 said to Eelken, the martyr, “What do you hold concerning the sacrament?” His answer was, “I know nothing of your baked god.” To Fye, also a martyr, it was said, “Will you not do such a mercy as to receive this bread and wine?” He replied, “For your bread and wine I do not hunger; food is prepared for me in Heaven.” Fye was strangled and then burned. Before his death the persecutors led him to the ship where Eelken lay beheaded.

Martin Luther, the Reformer (died 1546), says: "This much I confess: if Dr. Karlstadt or any one else could have convinced me five years ago that there was nothing but bread and wine in the sacrament, he would have rendered me a great service. The Word of God is higher than all things, the soul cannot do without it, but it may do without the sacrament; then will the true Bishop Himself feed thee spiritually. All laws and ceremonies should be free in the church, and not be done on compulsion."

"If divers men should use a diverse rite, let not one judge or condemn another, but let every one abound in his own sense; and let us all savor and judge the same things, though in forms we act diversely; for outward rites, as we cannot want them either as meat and drink, *so neither do they commend us to God*, but only faith and love commend us to Him. Therefore let Paul be heard here that the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. And so no rite or form is the kingdom of God, but faith within us."

"The sacrament, the altar, *the priest, the Church*, we may pass them all by; that Word of God, which the bull of the pope condemned, is more than all these things. *The soul may dispense with the sacrament*, but it cannot live without the Word. Christ, the true Bishop, *will Himself supply your spiritual feast.*"

Robert Barclay, Quaker Reformer (died A. D. 1690), says: "'I am the Bread of Life,' saith He. 'He that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.' (John 6:35.) And again, 'For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood,' saith Christ, 'dwelleth in me, and I in him.' (John 6:55,56.) This cannot be understood of outward eating of outward bread; and as by this the soul must have fellowship with God, so also, so far as all the Saints are partakers of this one body and one blood, they come also to have a joint communion. Hence the apostle, in this respect, saith that

they, 'being many are one bread, and one body:' (1 Cor. 10,17), and to the wise among the Corinthians he saith, 'The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?' (1 Cor. 10,16.) This is the true and spiritual supper of the Lord, which men come to partake of by hearing the voice of Christ, and opening the door of their hearts, and so letting Him in according to the plain words of the Scripture, Rev. 3:20, 'Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me.' So that the supper of the Lord, and the supping with the Lord, and the partaking of His flesh and blood, is no ways limited to the ceremony of breaking bread and drinking wine. We certainly know that the day is dawned in which God hath dismissed all these ceremonies and rites, and is only to be worshiped in spirit, and that He appears to them who wait upon Him, and that to seek God in these things, is, with Mary at the sepulchre, to seek the living among the dead: for we know that He is risen and revealed in spirit, leading His children out of these rudiments, that they may walk with Him in His light: to whom be glory forever. Amen."

In *Denominations of the World*, by V.S. Miller, is the following: "With respect to the other rite, we believe that communion between Christ and His Church is not maintained by that or any other external performance, but only by a real participation of His divine nature through faith; that this is the supper alluded to in Rev. 3:20. Where the substance is attained, it is unnecessary to attend to the shadow, which doth not confer grace, and concerning which opinions so different and animosities so violent have arisen. The Rellyanists are the followers of Mr. James Relly. He first commenced his ministerial character in connection with Mr. Whitefield, and was received with great popularity. Upon a change of his views, he encountered reproach. He preached a finished salvation, called by the Apostle Jude 'the

common salvation.' Many of his followers are removed to the world of spirits, but a branch still survives. They are not observers of ordinances, such as water baptism and the sacrament; professing to believe only in one baptism, which they call an immersion of the mind or conscience into the truth by the teaching of the Spirit of God; and by the same Spirit they are enabled to feed on Christ as the Bread of Life, professing that in and with Jesus they possess all things."

Joseph Phipps, in *True Christian Baptism and Communion*, says: "If, as the apostle declares, 'The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost' (Rom. 14:17), it is not bread and wine, which are meat and drink. Nevertheless, we condemn not those who are conscientious in the use of them."

"He is not a real Christian who is only one by profession and form; neither is that the baptism nor the communion of the gospel, which is outward and ceremonial; but he is a Christian who is one inwardly, and that is the true baptism and the true communion which is of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter or outward form."

Henry Ward Beecher says: "I thought I would say a few words this evening, in answer to several questions that have been propounded to me on the subject of *The Lord's Supper*, or, *The Communion of the Last Supper*. The disciples had made preparation, you will recollect, being sent by the Master, to celebrate *the Passover*—perhaps the most conspicuous and important of the three great festivals which the Jews were accustomed to celebrate every year marking their great national release from bondage. And we have a very accurate account, derived from authentic Jewish writings, of the whole mode in which the Passover was accustomed to be celebrated. The Paschal Supper, the mode of its preparation, administration and participation, was all very minutely put down in the Jew-

ish books, so that we are not left without a knowledge of the particulars of that gathering when Jesus and His disciples sat eating the Paschal Supper."

"They were *all Jews in feeling as well as in nationality*. OUR MASTER WAS ACCUSTOMED TO ENTER INTO ALL THE PROPER ACTS OF JEWISH WORSHIP without questioning. He worshiped according to the customs of His own people, in the synagogue, everywhere."

"They were in the act of eating the Passover—the unleavened bread, the bitter herbs, and the prepared lamb. Then, at the close of this Paschal Service, the remains being there, the Saviour gave new significance to the bread. Handing a fragment to every one that was present, he said, 'This is my body, which is broken for you.' They came into the meaning of it afterward. And then He took the cup, which had been used *already in the Jewish Passover of the Paschal Supper*, and again gave it to them, as it were a fourth time and said it was His blood shed for them."

"*There was no command* that it should be observed every day. THERE WAS NO COMMAND that it should be observed every week. THERE WAS NO COMMAND THAT IT SHOULD BE OBSERVED AT ALL. It was celebrated more or less frequently just according to circumstances. It was probably more than two hundred years before it began to be a sacrament, or a ceremony. It was full three or four hundred years before it ever began to be called an *awful* service, a *solemn* service, a service peculiarly filled with awe."

"*Afterward it became corrupted. It became a sacrament.* Men began to surround it with various ceremonies. And then they began to teach that it was a special channel through which otherwise incommunicable blessings were sent down. Then it began to be taught that the Lord's body and blood were absolutely in the bread and wine."

Joseph J. Gurney says: "*It is the Spirit that quickeneth,*" as our Saviour Himself has taught us,

‘*the flesh profiteth nothing;*’ and Christianity is distinguished by a *spiritual* supper, as well as baptism. To partake of *this* supper is essential to our salvation. We can never have a claim on the hopes and joys set before us in the gospel unless we feed, by a living faith, on the Bread which came down from Heaven, and giveth life to the world—unless we ‘eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood.’ Now they who partake of this celestial food are fellow-members of one body; they are joined together by a social compact of the dearest and holiest character, because they all commune with the same glorious Head. They are *one in Christ Jesus*; and when they meet in solemn worship—Christ Himself being present—they are guests, even here, at the table of their Lord, and drink the wine ‘new,’ with Him ‘in His kingdom.’ May this be the happy experience of all who read this volume, whether they use or disuse what is called the sacrament of the supper!”

Thomas Clarkson, in his admirable work which treats on the disuse of rites, says: “Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that Bread from Heaven; but my Father giveth you the true Bread from Heaven. For the Bread of God is He that cometh down from Heaven, and giveth life unto the world.’ (John 6:32,33.) ‘Then said they unto Him, Lord, evermore give us this Bread. And Jesus said unto them, I am the Bread of Life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth in me shall never thirst.’” (John 6:34,35.)

“It appears that in the course of these and other words that were spoken upon this occasion, the Jews took offence at Jesus Christ, because He said He was the Bread that came down from Heaven; for they knew He was the son of Joseph, and they knew both His father and mother. Jesus, therefore, directed to them the following observations: ‘*I am that Bread of Life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the Bread which cometh down from Heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die.*’

I am the Living Bread which came down from Heaven: if any man eat of this Bread, *he shall live forever*: and the Bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us His flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. *This is that Bread that came down from Heaven; not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this Bread shall live forever.*” (John 6:48-58.)

“This Bread, then, or this Body, is of a spiritual nature. It is of a spiritual nature, because it not only giveth life, but preserveth from death. Manna, on the other hand, supported the Israelites only for a time, and they died. Common bread and flesh nourish the body for a time, and it dies and perishes; but it is said of those who feed upon this food, that they shall never die. This bread or body must be spiritual again, because the bodies of men, according to their present organization, cannot be kept forever alive. But their souls may. The souls of men can receive no nourishment from ordinary meat and drink, that they should be kept alive, but from that which is spiritual only. It must be spiritual again, because Jesus Christ describes it as having come down from Heaven.”

“This Supper, which consists of this manna, or Bread, or of this flesh or blood, may be enjoyed by Christians in various ways. It may be enjoyed by them *in pious meditations on the Divine Being*, IN WHICH THE SOUL OF MAN MAY HAVE COMMUNION WITH

THE SPIRIT OF GOD, so that every meditation may afford it a salutary supper, or a celestial feast. It may be enjoyed by them *when they wait upon God in silence, or RETIRE INTO THE LIGHT OF THE LORD*, and receive those divine impressions, *which quicken and spiritualize the internal man*. It may be enjoyed by them in all their several acts of obedience and regard to the words and doctrines of our Saviour. Thus may men every day, nay, every hour, keep a communion at the Lord's table, or communicate, or sup, with Christ."

John Allen, in his "*State Churches*," says: "At the feast of the Passover, it was customary among the Jews for the master of the house to take unleavened bread, then giving thanks to God, to break it and give to the family; likewise to take the cup, give thanks, and distribute it to the household. This our Lord fulfilled according to the law; but at the last Passover Supper He also drew their attention from the paschal lamb and the deliverance of their forefathers, the objects originally commemorated by the Passover, to the breaking of His own body, and to the deliverance of man from sin, being the great purposes typified by both."

"The practice of breaking bread and drinking wine together, as a religious ceremony, prevailed extensively in the early periods of Christianity, and was observed in various modes, according to the views of different churches. And this observance has been for ages, touching its nature, effects and mode of celebration, the cause of more bitter controversy between Roman Catholics and Protestants and of more blood being shed than any other matter of difference."

"For the long period of nearly two hundred years from the time of Henry IV., about A. D. 1400, to the reign of James I., it was made the principal test of religious faith, both in England and on the continent of Europe; and the Roman Catholics more especially, but not exclusively, when they possessed the chief secular power, condemned and burned as heretics,

without distinction of age or sex, those who differed from their own views upon it."

"It was a common practice at the execution of heretics to fasten about their necks scraps of scripture and other evidence of their supposed guilt found in their possession, that the whole might be burnt together. Of all the matters which in England were condemned as heresies and *punished in this awful manner*, the differences of opinion with respect to the bread and the wine have been by far the most prominent and fruitful of victims."

"The earliest Christian writers scarcely allude to this rite. Tertullian speaks of the celebration of the Eucharist in connection with the meals of the early Christians; as we read of the 'breaking of bread' in private houses and public assemblies. Irenæus contended, about the year 200, that the Eucharist should be regarded as 'a sacrifice;' thus opening a floodgate through which the Church was deluged with error. Public prayers were followed by oblations of bread, wine and other things; every one offering according to his ability; and partly from hence, all those who were in necessity derived their subsistence."

"The Eucharist was generally received once a week, or oftener, in the Second and Third Centuries, by the diligent and zealous. Ambrose seemed to regard every celebration to be as great a mystery and miracle as the incarnation! The idea being now generally received that this rite was a 'sacrifice,' altars were substituted for tables, and other sacrificial appendages followed. Priestcraft found in this idea a strong support, and grasped it with eagerness."

"The sign of the cross was introduced. Pomp and splendor were displayed, and rich vessels of gold and silver were deemed necessary articles. The word 'mass' was not known in the primitive Church, nor is it found in the works of Augustine, Chrysostom, and other writers of the Fourth Century. They termed the ceremony 'the Supper of the Lord,' 'the mystical supper or table,' 'the Eucharist,' 'celebration of the sac-

rament,' 'the Lord's board,' 'oblation,' 'communion,' 'mystery,' etc. Certain Christians, called *Aquarii*, used water at the Eucharist instead of wine. The Ebionites did the same. Others used water mingled with wine, which was said to denote the union of the Church with Christ. This was the general practice. Some substituted milk, honey, or grapes for wine. The Ascodnitæ and Messalians, or Euchites, *held that the sacrament of bread and wine did neither good nor harm* AND REJECTED ITS USE. They subsisted through several hundred years."

"The Eucharist had already been administered to infants; it was now given to dead persons. It formed a part of the divine worship, was used to consecrate every religious act, and was occasionally celebrated at the tombs of martyrs, whence followed *masses for the dead*."

"The bread and wine were held up to the view of the people before distribution, that they might gaze on it with reverence. The bread was usually broken to signify the breaking of the body of Christ. At other times it was pierced with a spear and said to be immolated. With the remains of the Eucharist, and with other oblations, it had long been usual to hold the 'agapæ, or feasts of charity,' being a liberal collation of the rich to feed the poor; but this practice giving rise to various abuses was prohibited in the Sixth and Seventh Centuries."

"The Canon of the Mass, instituted by Pope Gregory the Great, about the year 620, for the celebration of the Eucharist, occasioned a remarkable change by the 'introduction of a lengthened, pompous ritual.'"

"It was still generally performed in the language of each particular country, and the first time it was openly said in Latin appears to have been at the Council of Constance, by the Pope's legate in 681. The administration of the sacrament was now deemed the most solemn and important part of public devotion, and was everywhere embellished with a variety of senseless appendages. The burning of incense re-

ceived general sanction. Charlemagne made some attempts to stem the torrent of superstition, but with little success."

"For a very long period the sacrament of the bread and wine was viewed and employed by the great body of Catholics as a sort of charm or amulet, to heal bodily diseases in men, or in cattle; to insure success, and avert calamities, as well as to administer truth to the soul. Voyagers carried with them consecrated bread as a pledge for their preservation. It was often administered with absolution to the sick or dying, and was then termed the *viaticum*, or provision for their journey into the next world. It was sometimes even buried with the corpse. These notions were warmly urged by the corrupt and selfish priests."

"It had been common to pronounce the consecration of the Eucharist audibly and intelligibly, that the people might hear, and answer 'Amen,' but in the Tenth Century the contrary practice of 'intonation,' or *pronouncing the services in a low voice*, began to be introduced to render them more mysterious."

"By the corporation and test acts, passed in the reign of Charles II, the taking the 'sacrament of the Lord's Supper' was made necessary to the holding of all places of trust in England and Wales—the object being the exclusion of dissenters—an object which was enforced for a century and a half. These acts never extended to Scotland. The effect in England was to make the ceremony, in many cases, a mere passport to office for the unscrupulous and irreligious. The high-church notion of self-restricted authority appears in the following, under date of 1820: 'A person not commissioned from the bishop may break bread and pour out wine, and pretend to give the Lord's Supper; but it can afford no comfort to receive it at his hands, because there is *no warrant* from Christ to lead communicants to suppose that, while *he* does so here on earth, they will be partakers in the Saviour's heavenly body and blood.' Hence all such observances by non-conformist ministers are vain and fruitless."

Basil (died A. D. 379) says: "There is an intellectual mouth of the inward man, at which he is fed who partakes of the Word of Life, which is the Bread that came down from Heaven."

Augustine (died A. D. 430?) says: "Why dost thou prepare thy teeth and thy stomach? *Believe and thou hast eaten.* To believe on Him is to eat the Living Bread! The Bread of our heart is that whereon he feeds who eats inwardly, not outwardly. To abide in Christ, and to have Christ abiding in us, is to eat that meat and to drink that drink."

Pres. C. G. Finney says: "I had infinitely rather receive the Quaker view of ordinances, than that of the (exclusive) Baptists."

Dr. Ira Bristol says: "The more of the external rites we employ, the more we approximate the customs of idolatry, and the less, the nearer the worship of Heaven."

Origen (died A. D. 253?) says: "There is in the *New Testament a letter that kills him that doth not spiritually mind the things that are spoken*; for if thou observest this saying literally, 'except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood,' the letter killeth."

Chrysostom (died A. D. 407) says: "'*The flesh profiteth nothing*,' *i. e.*, my words are to be understood spiritually, because he that heareth them carnally profits nothing; for they are not to be judged of by the outward appearance, simply as the words without any further consideration, but the mystery is to be perceived by the inward eyes of the soul, *i. e.*, spiritually. Christ is always with us."

Cyprian (died A. D. 258?) says: "The eating of Christ is our abiding in Him; and our drinking is, as it were, a certain incorporation in Him. None eateth of this Lamb, but such as be true Israelites—*i. e.*, true Christian men, without color or dissimulation. He is the food of the mind, not of the stomach.

What meat is to the flesh, real faith is to the soul : we whet not our teeth to eat, but we break holy bread with a sincere faith."

Gregory Nazianzen (died A. D. 389 ?) says : " Shall they keep me from the altars (*i. e.*, from the outward supper), but I know an altar of which the things seen are types and figures. The whole is the work of the mind, and *the ascent to it is by divine contemplation.* On this altar I will offer an acceptable sacrifice and oblation, and whole burnt-offerings, so much better than those now offered, as the truth is better than the shadow."

Dr. J. A. Tabor says : " It cannot be too often repeated that the kingdom of God cometh not with observation—is not an exhibition, but an internal, vital principle. Keep simplicity—keep spirituality : but to do this we must come to the Divine Architect of the soul, and ask Him to build up that *in the beauty of holiness!*"

Besse says : " If wicked men do not partake of the communion of the body and blood of Christ, who yet do partake of the outward bread and wine, it plainly follows that outward bread and wine is not the communion of the body and blood of Christ."

Ignatius (died A. D. 107 ?) says : " So the *logos*, or Word, is diversely allegorized, being termed *meat*, and *flesh*, and *bread*, and *milk*, and *nourishment* ; all is the Lord, to be enjoyed by us, who have believed in Him."

Adam Clarke says : " ' Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life,' etc., can never be understood of the Lord's Supper."

In "*Conversations on Religious Subjects*," S. M. Janney says : " All the ceremonies of the Mosaic law were observed by Jesus Christ ; for that law was not abrogated till after His crucifixion. The Passover was

one of these ceremonies, and had a more immediate reference to Himself than any of the others. It is not surprising, then, that He should, while celebrating this feast, endeavor to turn the attention of His followers to the spiritual meaning of it, by speaking of that Bread which comes down from Heaven and nourishes the soul, and of that wine which He would drink new with them in His Father's kingdom. He told them, as often as they ate and drank, to do it in remembrance of Him; and thereby they would show forth His death '*till He come.*' But did He not come to them again to rule and to reign in them, when, after waiting at Jerusalem, they were all baptized with the Holy Spirit? This was the fulfilment of His promise: 'I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you,' and 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.' This was to them the second appearance of Christ. And to every regenerated soul He still appears in spirit, and is that substance and life which fulfills all the shadows and ceremonies of the law."

That the rites and ceremonies of Judaism were by some of the early-century Christians again taken up is shown and proven in this work, but that there were also some then and all along down the line of the centuries who testified against them is also shown and proven herein. But we now insert more on the same line, proving that a very numerous class of the early Christians rejected rites and ordinances, some of them discarding them in part, others entirely, while others seem to have recognized them as non-essentials, though possibly in some instances, at times, observing them.

"*Ritualism Dethroned,*" concerning Tatian (of the Second Century), says: "It may be added that Tatian, an Assyrian by birth, and an eminent scholar, having read a portion of the Scriptures, became convinced of the truth of their teachings, and embraced Christianity. He proceeded to Rome, and put himself under

the teachings of *Justin Martyr*, and like him became eminent for piety and temperance in all things; like him rejected the Jewish rituals, dissuaded from the baptism of water and all use of wine. After the martyrdom of Justin, he became a teacher in Rome for some years, and afterwards returned as a missionary of Christ to his own country."

Irenæus (died about A. D. 200) says: "The Mosaic law was not established for righteous men. Abraham, without circumcision, and Lot, receiving salvation from God; *they* had the meaning of the law written in their hearts; but when righteousness and love to God became extinct in Egypt, God did necessarily reveal Himself, that thou mightest know that man *doth not live by bread alone*, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. God, standing in no need of anything from man, speaks thus by Moses, 'And what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly.'"

Neander, the historian, says of the reaction brought about by the efforts of Marcion: "A reaction of the Christian consciousness reasserting the independence acquired for it by the labors of Paul against a new combination of the *Jewish and Christian elements*; a reaction of the Protestant spirit against the Catholic element now swelling in the bud."

Manes, or Mani (martyred about A. D. 277), was an eminent scholar, mathematician and astronomer. After embracing Christianity, he devoted his time and energy to the promulgation of the truth as he saw it. Concerning Manes, one historian says: "By traducing ritualists and heresy-hunters he was much maligned, but his real character shone all the more brightly because of the dark background in which his enemies sought to place him. Notwithstanding all this traduction he became the acknowledged head of a long line of self-denying and non-ritualistic followers, among whom were included a great number of witnesses for a holy life and conversation, for temperance in all things, and death to earthly ambitions."

History testifies that the non-ritualists continued to advocate that doctrine in Asia, Eastern Europe and Northern Africa until the Fourth Century. Mark, a native of Memphis, Egypt, who testified against ritualistic tendencies, went to Spain to preach. The effort seemed successful and embraced people of learning and piety. Among them was Priscillian, bishop of Avila. For his doctrine Priscillian was banished from Spain, but returning again he was tried with others of his associates; *testimony against himself being extorted by the rack*. He was executed at Treves, A. D. 385.

The Euchites, or "praying ones," the historical records indicate, rose in the latter part of the Third Century, and in the early part of the Fourth Century. They were an interesting class of non-ritualistic pietists.

The Paulicians flourished from A. D. 600 to A. D. 900. They were a protesting and non-ritualistic people that arose in Armenia, Western Asia, and were most prominent in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries. Of them Neander, the historian, says: "They were for restoring the life and manners of the Church to apostolic simplicity; they maintained that by the multiplication of external rites and ceremonies in the dominant Church *the true life of RELIGION had declined*. They combated an inclination to rely on the magic effects of external forms, particularly the sacraments. They maintained that it was by no means Christ's intention to institute the *baptism by water* as a perpetual ordinance, but that by baptism He meant only the baptism of the Spirit, for by His teachings He communicated Himself as the Living Water for the thorough cleansing of the entire human nature. So in respect to the supper: They held that the eating of the flesh and drinking of the blood of Christ consisted simply in the coming into vital union with Him through His doctrines, His Word, which were His true flesh and blood. It was not sensible bread and sensible wine, but His words, which were to be *the same for the soul that bread and wine are for the body*, which He designated as His flesh and His blood."

The Orleanists, of France, arose about A. D. 1000. Of them Neander, the historian, says: "With a spiritual baptism they held also to a spiritual Eucharist. In the year 1022 the king himself (Robert of France) came to Orleans, where a numerous synod had assembled, to try and pass sentence upon the sect. Fallen upon during one of their meetings, of which information had been given by Arefast, all who were found present were arrested, together with Arefast himself, and conveyed in chains before the spiritual tribunal, where also the king and queen assisted. When Arefast presented before them the doctrines they had taught him, they no longer hesitated to avow openly their adherence of them, but declared, 'Think not that this sect, because ye have so lately come to the knowledge of it, has sprung up within a short period. For a long time we have professed these doctrines, and we expected that these doctrines would one day be admitted by you and by all others; this we believe still. *We have a higher law, ONE WRITTEN BY THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE INNER MAN*; we can believe nothing but that which God, the Creator of all things, has revealed to us. Do with us as you please. Already we behold our King reigning in Heaven, whose right hand shall exalt as to an eternal triumph, and crown us with celestial joys.'"

About the Gerhardites, Neander, the historian, says: "From the year A. D. 1027 to 1046, there appeared in Turin a sect, with Gerhard at their head, who discoursed thus: 'We have a priest, not that Roman one, but another, who daily visits our brethren, scattered through the world; and when God bestowed Him on them, they received from Him, with great devoutness, the forgiveness of sins. Besides this priest, who is without the tonsure, they know of no other, nor did they acknowledge any other sacrament than His absolution.' Thus we find in this sect, as in that at Orleans, the consciousness of a fellowship extending through different countries. By their priest, they doubtless meant the Holy Spirit, which

formed the invisible bond of fellowship, and bestowed on them the inward clearing from remaining sin, and the inward consecration of the divine life. *This inward working of the Divine Spirit stood to them in the place of all sacraments.*"

"The archbishop of Milan sent soldiers and arrested a number of these ; they were led to the stake, and the choice given them either to bow before a cross erected on the spot, and confess the Catholic faith, or die, Some chose to do the former, but the majority plunged into the flames."

Concerning the Catharists, about A. D. 1200, Neander, the historian, says : "They sought to point out the opposition between the Old Testament and the New, and appealed to the opposition between the Sermon on the Mount and the Mosaic law. They said of the members of the dominant Church that they had sunk back on the foundation of the Mosaic law. They contended not only against infant baptism, with *arguments always presenting themselves against the institution as apostolical, but also against water-baptism.*"

"They, the Catharists, Arranians, Paulicians, etc., awaked in the ignorant and uninstructed people, who had been misled by incompetent priests to place the essence of religion in a round of ceremonies, a more lively interest in spiritual concerns. They called up in them the idea of a divine life, presented religion to them more as a matter of inward experience, and, perhaps, as this was the particular bent of the Paulicians, made them better acquainted with the Scriptures."

In "*Milman's History of Latin Christianity*" is found the valuable record of a people known as *mystics*, and here evidence is continued that the Lord has always had a people to witness for the truth while surrounded by the blindness and bigotry of a popular and persecuting Christianity. The work says : "From 1247 to 1272 the Franciscan Bertholdt, of Winterthur, preached with amazing success through Bavaria, Austria, Moravia, and Thuringen. The dis-

sidents under their various names were everywhere. At the beginning of the Fourteenth Century Alsace was almost in possession of the *brethren and sisters of the free spirit*. They were driven out and scattered; but expulsion and dispersion, if it does not multiply the numbers, usually increases the force and power of such communities. *Mysticism* within the Church strove to fill the void caused by their expulsion. Of these Mystics the most famous names are Rysbroeck, of Cologne, Master Eckhart, John Tauler and Nicolas, of Basle. The life of Tauler will show us the times and the personal influence of these men."

Concerning the Lollards, of A. D. 1350, the *Religious Encyclopædia* says: "Lollards, a religious sect, arose in Germany about the beginning of the Fourteenth Century, and were so called from *Walter Lollard*, a German preacher (as Perrin, in his history of the Waldenses, calls him), a man of great renown, who came to England in the reign of Edward III (about A. D. 1315)."

"Lollard and his followers rejected the sacrifice of the mass, extreme unction and penance for sin, arguing that *Christ's sufferings were sufficient*. He is likewise said to have set aside baptism as a thing of no effect. Among the articles required by law, guiding the inquisitors in their examination of the Lollards, one was: 'Whether an infant dying unbaptized can be saved?' This the Lollards constantly asserted in opposition to the Church of Rome, which decreed that no infant could be saved without it. Fox says that among the errors they were charged with were these: 'That they spoke against the opinion of such as think that children are damned who depart before baptism, and said that Christian people are sufficiently baptized in the blood of Christ, AND NEED NO WATER.'"

T. Seebohm, in a work entitled, "*The Oxford Reformers*" (Oxford, England, A. D. 1520), says: "Erasmus sought to bring out the facts of Christ's life as the true foundation of the Christian faith, instead of

the dogmas of the scholastic theology. At length, he writes : ' Read the New Testament through ; you will not find in it any precept which pertains to ceremonies. *Love* alone He calls *His* precept. *Ceremonies give rise to differences ; from love flows peace.* And yet we burden those who have been made free by the blood of Christ, with all those almost senseless, and more than Jewish constitutions.' "

William Allen, after a tour in Russia, where he met a sect known as Malakans, or Duhobertzi, says of them : " They believe in the Holy Scriptures and in the divinity of our Lord and Saviour as fully as we do ourselves, and that the influence of the Holy Spirit is not withheld from any. They believe that the only true baptism is that of Christ with the Spirit, and reject water-baptism as unnecessary. They consider that the communion with Christ is wholly spiritual, and make no outward ceremony. The Malakans extend on the east even to the Caucasus Mountains, and, counting all their societies, Grellet says they ' number about one hundred thousand.' "

George W. Green well says : " The ordinance brethren do not deny Christ, they only want to add something to Christ. He says, ' Ye are complete in Him,' and to add anything to Christ is to deny His completeness. Some add one thing and some another, but the wrong thing is to add anything at all. I think there has been enough said to show that these ordinances are only types and shadows, and that we are complete in Christ without them. So ' let brotherly love continue,' and lay hold on eternal life, and let us seek God with our whole heart and ' worship Him in spirit and in truth.' "

Another writer says : " God in the types of the last dispensation, was teaching His children their letters. In this dispensation He is teaching them to put these letters together, and they find that the letters, arrange them as we will, spell Christ ; nothing but Christ. "

As the history of denominations, the experience of congregations, and that of individual Christians has amply proven, again and again, that TRUE *union* cannot exist in an organization, or in an assembly, or among individual Christians where ordinances are made a test of fellowship, and as these ceremonies, because of the various and conflicting opinions held concerning them, have ever been the cause of contention and division, their observance or non-observance should be left optional with each individual Christian in the Association. Those who desire to observe them should be allowed liberty to do so, and by any mode they prefer, and those who do not want to observe them should be allowed equal liberty of conscience in not observing them.

Any officer, minister or other member of an organization or a congregation who advocates a course *contrary to liberty of conscience to all*, or who advocates any particular mode of administering or observing any fleshly ordinance or ceremony, to the injury of peace and unity, should be deemed guilty of sowing discord and causing division.

Where true *Christian union* is expected to exist, no dissension or controversy whatever on the subject of ordinances should be tolerated, either on the part of officers, ministers or lay members. Unless this course is insisted upon and maintained, peace and unity will not—cannot exist. *Controversy is the opposite of union.* History has repeated itself again and again in proof of this fact. Some Christians insist that the only way to maintain true *Christian union* WITHOUT CONTROVERSY AND DISCORD, is to observe no ordinances.

We have no hesitancy at all in saying that if TRUE FELLOWSHIP IN THE SPIRIT, and real CHRISTIAN UNION cannot be attained without dropping ordinances, *then let them be laid aside entirely.* Water cannot wash away sin ; bread and wine nourish not the soul.

JAN 18 1910

BY
180

One copy del. to Cat. Div.

JAN 25 1810

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 022 171 032 0