

P A P E R S

ON

SCRIPTURAL BAPTISM :

ITS

RELATION TO THE HOUSE OF GOD,

AS

DISTINGUISHED FROM THE BODY OF CHRIST.

BY

W. CORRIE JOHNSTON,

Including Papers by J. N. DARBY, and a Writer in the "*Bible Witness and Review*."

C O N T E N T S :

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTION	3
CHRISTIAN BAPTISM (From <i>Review</i>)	8
PRINCIPLES CONNECTED WITH BAPTISM	14
THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY GHOST	24
THE CHURCH—THE HOUSE AND THE BODY (J. N. D.) .	29
DISCIPLES—CHRISTIANS; BELIEVERS—BRETHREN	38
THE COMMISSION TO BAPTISE	41
SCRIPTURAL BAPTISM WIDER THAN BELIEVER'S BAPTISM	49
"ONE LORD, ONE FAITH, ONE BAPTISM"	55
VARIOUS STATES YET ONE PLACE IN BAPTISM	64
BAPTISM OF HOUSEHOLDS	72

GEORGE ROBERTSON, MELBOURNE, SYDNEY, AND
ADELAIDE.

PRICE NINEPENCE.

(Post free for Nine Penny Stamps, from MR. JOSEPH CLARKE, *Bible, Book, and Tract Depôt, Lichfield-street, Christchurch*).

INTRODUCTORY.

LETTERS, remarks, and statements have reached me regarding the subject of Baptism, and my having taken it up lately in lectures and readings. There is, on the one hand, such evident misunderstanding as to what is held and taught on the subject; and, on the other hand, such an earnest desire to know the truth, that it seems needful to issue something which inquirers may calmly weigh in the light of Scripture. This has led to the publishing of the following papers.

The fears expressed by many that the looking into the subject would lead to strife and division, I am happy to say, are not likely to be realised. The subject was first taken up by the enemy. His intention, like that of Balak, was evidently to curse and scatter. He threw the subject into the midst of those gathered to the name of the Lord, and raised the cry of heresy. The Lord has over-ruled, brought out the truth, and turned the attack into blessing; and who can reverse it? We have been blessed. The deep work in ploughing up and liberating souls, and giving largeness of heart and a more extensive view of the ways of God, as well as a better understanding of the right place of testimony, is beyond all many of the oldest believers have previously realised.

Instead of my taking up the subject causing division, the hope—yea, the faith—was given, that by so doing division would be prevented. Many godly brethren were alarmed by the rumour and cry of heresy. The enemy, working on the ignorance of what was held, pointed to what appeared to be a monster stalking in the mist, and raised suspicion, distrust and opposition, both inside and outside those gathered to the name of the Lord. It reminded me of a man who was on the mountain side in Scotland during one of those mists which cause even harmless and small objects to assume a weird and terrifying appearance. He saw in the distance what looked like a monster stalking in the mist. On approaching, it turned out to be a man. When he came up to him he recognised his own brother. Had he not had the courage to approach, he and

others might have lived under the shadow of terror caused by the apparition. Eminent servants of the Lord have heard of, and turned away from, this subject of baptism, leaving it to terrify feebler minds like a monster stalking in the mist. The enemy, in once more calling up the apparition to do duty, has been outwitted. The Lord gave the courage to approach. Instead of a monster, we have found a man, a brother. Instead of a heresy and the dividing and scattering of Christians, we have found the truth of God, and blessing in the uniting bond of peace.

On every hand I have been told that great men, and men of renown, never lectured or published on this subject. That has not hindered the devil from taking it up, nor the Lord from calling a lesser man to go out against the enemy. Their circumstances were not mine. They may be absent, or gone to be with the Lord; but God, His Word, and His Spirit abide. At the outset, in the middle, and at the end, through opposition, I have been led to say that what I was doing I had from the Lord. Now the lectures, extending over eight Lord's day afternoons, are finished. While keenly sensible of many shortcomings, and though I have failed in doing the work, or in apprehending the subject, or making it clear, I am free to say that I have not a question, even now, that what I did in the main was not of the Lord. In the face of this, even the oldest and wisest of brethren should pause. Are they prepared to touch the very foundation of real ministry, that the servant, the least of servants, is directly responsible to the Lord? Some of us have purchased that principle at too high a price to let it go, or even to bear trifling with it. Then let brothers of standing, and even those with grey hairs, take heed lest in saying what a servant ought or ought not to do, they should be rushing in where angels fear to tread, and supplanting the Lord or the Holy Ghost, and getting to the very threshold of "the gainsaying of Core."

Paul's words: "Christ sent me not to baptise but to preach the Gospel," have not been, nor, I trust, will they be, forgotten. In a period of about fifteen years of continual preaching I have never, till the present occasion, spoken ten minutes on Baptism. Others have spoken and written on the subject, and I have thought it wise to give a place in this pamphlet to two papers by well-known servants of the Lord. These papers, duly weighed, will be found to contain the principles of what I have advanced. One should be jealous

of getting occupied with questions rather than Christ, but those who know the circumstances referred to will be free to say that during the time the subject of Baptism was taken up in lectures, the worship meetings and prayer-meetings, and the occupation with Christ Himself surpassed anything they formerly experienced. When a subject is so looked at in the presence of, and in relation to, the Lord, truth and blessing are found. If it is taken up at all in the spirit of controversy, the door is opened both for the flesh and the devil. It is much the same to the enemy which side is pressed. He will gain his object; in sowing discord among brethren, and, possibly, scattering the children of God. But if those gathered to the Lord, owning Him as the Head, and all believers as members of one body, divide on the subject of baptism, they take the ground of gathering to a certain view of doctrine and at once becoming a sect. Further, by division they would show that they neither know what gathering to the Lord, nor baptism, really mean. If those who have a different judgment are hereby led to see they can go on happily together, in the fellowship of one body, or are led to search for, and find, the truth, there will be still greater cause for praise than what has already filled hearts to overflowing in connection with the lectures.

There are difficulties on the very threshold of the subject. Not the least of these are the teachings and habits of thought heard and practised till they have become a second nature. If one clings to these it is next to impossible to make any advance in the truth. While a person who has never known assurance of salvation denies that it may be known, he is not likely to come into the peace and joy of forgiveness. He must first admit that there is, possibly, something beyond what he has experienced. So in regard to Baptism; unless a person admits there is, possibly, something beyond what he has seen, and really throws his mind open to consider it without prejudice, he is only wasting time over the subject. It is clear that, in dealing with a doubting soul as to assurance, it would not be a question as to whether there were texts or not, but a question as to whether he would see and own what another sees in the texts and principles put before him. Will he give up his own thoughts and get rid of the habits of mind to which he has yielded, and allow the Spirit, by the Word, to write on his mind as on a blank sheet of paper? An evangelist could give such an one truth, but he

cannot give him eyes to see it, nor grace to make him willing to bow to it. But if he does see and bow, he will cease to be an unassured soul. So my readers will bear with me in insisting that if they will do likewise, and see and bow to the truth, they will cease to be strong advocates of Believer's Baptism. In both cases it is not so much a question of texts and principles as of state of soul, and being humble enough to own one has been wrong, and be sincerely desirous of learning the truth. "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God."

Before coming directly to the subject it may be well to say a few words as to points of agreement between those who hold Believer's Baptism and those who would baptise Households. They are at one as to the mode of baptism being immersion. John is said to have been baptising in Ænon, because there was much water there.—John iii. 23. In Rom. vi. and Col. ii. we are said to be "buried with Him by baptism," and "planted together in the likeness of His death." No mere sprinkling of water can adequately set forth burial. It is therefore held in common that the proper mode is immersion. It is also agreed that baptism is the initiatory ordinance of Christianity, and that all believers ought to be baptised, if they have not formerly been baptised in some way, before taking their places at the Lord's Table. As to the meaning of Baptism, it is agreed that neither life nor grace are conferred thereby. As to the past it sets forth by burial in water that death and judgment were due. As to the future it admits the person baptised to a place of privilege and responsibility. The only proper consistent answer to being baptised is that there should not only be life and the Holy Spirit in a new nature, but that faith should reckon the old man crucified with Christ and be free to say, "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." It is allowed that to stop short of this in conduct is to fail to live out what was implied in being baptised. But as it was said of the Jew, it may also be said of the Gentile, admitted to privilege, "For what if some did not believe, shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid! Yea, let God be true, but every man a liar."—Rom. iii. 1-4.

It may stimulate enquiry, and give some idea of the importance of the subject, if I indicate the range of truth and principles with which baptism is connected, as it is now to be

presented. This calls to mind the letters and testimonies which I have received. Quite independently of one another the writers owned that, in regard to Deliverance, Church Truth, and the Coming of the Lord, I taught "as it is written." This was questioned and denied as to my teaching on Baptism; but I am free to say that I see what I teach on Baptism as distinctly in Scripture as what I teach on the truths just mentioned. I have three times received, as it were, a new Bible. First, when I saw the truth of Deliverance with the possibility of reckoning that I was dead and risen with Christ, and part of the new creation; second, when I saw that by the personal presence of the Holy Ghost the Church was formed, and being prepared to be caught up at the Coming of the Lord; third, when I saw the range of the truth and principles connected with this subject of Baptism. Does this appear strange and strong? It is true. Moreover, the last truth has appeared the most marvellous, as it casts such light upon the other truths, and enlarges one's view and heart as the other truths could not do alone. It will appear extravagant to say that the truth and principles connected with baptism take in the other truths as the hangings of the court or the covering of badger-skins included all that was in the Tabernacle. The principles range from creation till eternity, and take in the new heavens and the new earth; when at last the outward position and inward condition of all things shall be established in righteousness dwelling on the earth through the Second Man. More will be said on this in another paper, but it will not be expected that in the present pamphlet many parts of so large a subject can be discussed. It has yielded abundant material for eight lectures, each of fully an hour's speaking. Enough may be brought before the reader, however, to put him on the track, if he desires to follow it out for himself. At this point I give place to one of the papers, to which I have referred.

W.C.J.

PAPERS ON SCRIPTURAL BAPTISM :

ITS

RELATION TO THE HOUSE OF GOD,

AS DISTINGUISHED FROM THE BODY OF CHRIST.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

(*From the Bible Witness and Review*).

What is the teaching of Scripture on baptism? Let us turn to the divine Word for an answer to that question. In the New Testament we meet with three different baptisms—that of John, that instituted by the Lord, and that of the Holy Ghost. The two first were effected by water; the last by the coming of the Holy Ghost. Now, these are never confounded, though the two former are always termed *baptisma*, never *baptismos*, which latter term is confined, in its use in the New Testament, to the Jewish rite of washing cups, pots, brazen vessels, or tables (Mark vii. ; Heb. vi. 2 ; ix. 10). The baptism of John was only for a time, *i.e.*, during the ministry of the Baptist. The baptism instituted by the Lord Jesus was for all His disciples, from Pentecost until He returns to reign, as the commission in Matthew (xxviii. 19, 20) would seem to intimate. The baptism of the Holy Ghost, baptizing all believers into one body, is limited to Christian times, which, commencing with Pentecost, will terminate with the rapture of the saints (1 Thess. iv. 15-18).

The baptism of John was appointed for all whose consciences were stirred by his preaching of repentance. The person who heard him, and was convicted, and repented, owned, by submitting to that rite at his hands, that he had failed utterly and hopelessly under the law, but, confessing his sins and repenting of them, awaited the mercy of God to be manifested in forgiveness of his sins. For though John

preached the baptism of repentance for *eis*, remission of sins (Mark i. 4),—the forgiveness desired by the one baptized—John could not confer. But every one who truly repented, and owned it by being thus baptized, could know that he was on the way to enjoy it. The announcement of forgiveness of sins was reserved for the Lord Jesus Christ first to declare (Luke vii. 49). Thus John's baptism marked a transitional state of things between the law and the enjoyment of grace. All baptized by him expressed thereby that they had failed under the law, and that nothing was left for them but to rest on the sovereign mercy of God. The rite was a telling one, and a humbling one. Righteousness by works of law, each baptized one confessed by that rite that it was impossible for him to obtain. Hence reality was desired by John in all who went out to him to Jordan; so he challenged those who, following in the general movement, came to be baptized without truly repenting of their sins, "O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance" (Matt. iii. 7). Grace, life, or salvation, it is clear, then, John's baptism could not confer; else why warn souls of the necessity of a work in the heart if they would escape the wrath to come.

To this ordinance the Lord Jesus submitted that He might enter in by the door into the sheepfold, for, conforming to all Jehovah's appointed ordinances, He thereby fulfilled all righteousness. But subsequently, after His resurrection, He instituted the right of Christian baptism, which, like that of John, is a baptism of water. But differing from John, the Lord Jesus Himself never baptized with water, though it was reported, but the Evangelist corrects the report, that He did. "Though," writes John, "Jesus Himself baptized not, but His disciples" (John iv. 2). Was that spoken of in John iv. Christian Baptism? Clearly not, Christian baptism is burial with Christ unto death, as Rom. vi. 4 states. Hence Christian baptism could not be, and we know was not, instituted till after the Lord's resurrection. Is John's baptism and Christian baptism the same? If so, why did the Lord institute the latter? In truth these have nothing to do with each other. And Paul makes that plain in Acts xix. 3-5, where certain disciples, believers, who had been baptized unto John's baptism, were baptized with Christian baptism when the apostle taught them the essential difference between them. John baptized in view of One that was to come. Christian

baptism is the acknowledgment that He has come, has died, and is risen. Hence baptism at the hand of John did not stand in the place of Christian baptism. The differences between them are essential. To confound them would indicate ignorance of Scripture teaching respecting them.

Does Christian baptism confer life or salvation? It should be remarked that, when the Lord instituted it, He commanded His disciples to baptize, but made no provision for those whom He addressed to be baptized; nor is there a hint that they ever were baptized with Christian baptism, though they properly insisted on all who believed on and after Pentecost submitting to that rite. "He that believeth and is baptized," we read, "shall be saved. He that believeth not shall be condemned" (Mark xvi. 16). No one who was not willing, after the death and resurrection of the Lord, to confess Him openly by being baptized unto His name could reckon on salvation. The rite does not confer it. But the one who believes and is baptized has it. Paul, then, was baptized with Christian baptism, whereas Peter was not, and their writings agree as to this. Paul, writing of it to the Romans, owns that he and they had submitted to it (vi. 4). Peter, addressing those believers from among the Jews who had never seen the Lord, writes that baptism now saves *you*, not *us*, as the *Textus Receptus* reads. Life then, and salvation do not flow from it, else all Christians must have passed through it; nor, if that were the case, could any have received the gift of the Holy Ghost without it, whereas Cornelius and his friends received that gift previous to their being baptized (Acts x. 47), and the one hundred and twenty in the upper room at Pentecost received the same gift without any provision having been made for their baptism in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

In truth, these last did not need it, as we can understand when we ask of the same Scriptures what Christian baptism really is. The answer to this question is given us in the writings of Paul. The practical teaching about it is furnished by the epistles of both Peter and Paul. Addressing the Galatians, iii. 27., Paul says, "as many of you as have been baptized *eis* unto Christ have put on Christ." By baptism, then, we put on Christ. It is profession of discipleship. It speaks of what we put on. It does not impart anything to us within. The putting on Christ is not the same as having Christ in us. Of old all who passed through the Red Sea

were baptized unto *eis* Moses in the cloud and in the sea (1 Cor. x. 2). All believers since Pentecost have been baptized unto *eis* Christ, thereby openly entering the ranks of His disciples, to be known as such before all the world. When He was upon earth His disciples were seen and known to be such, as they journeyed about with Him, or owned Him to be their Teacher, and obeyed what He said to them. Such had no need to be baptized after His resurrection to be ranked as disciples of Christ. They had taken their place as disciples already. But since He has actually died, passing off this scene by death, how can people now be put into His company? If they actually died, they would be no longer on earth. That would not do. So they are buried with Him by baptism unto death, for burial is the open declaration that any one has passed off this scene; as Abraham, addressing the sons of Heth, asked for a possession of a burying-place that he might bury his dead out of his sight (Gen. xxiii. 4). Would any desire, from fear of man, to be a disciple of Christ in secret, and so decline to confess Him openly by baptism? Scripture would not own such a one as a disciple, nor could that person be rightly credited with the name of a Christian. So Peter, addressing those Jews who were pricked to their heart on the day of Pentecost, told them (Acts ii.) to repent and be baptized every one of them in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and they would receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. They had outwardly to separate from Judaism, and openly to be enrolled as disciples of Christ. And so really was this rite understood to be the confession of discipleship, that Paul at Corinth baptized himself but few, lest any should say that he baptized unto *eis* his own name (1 Cor. i. 15). Burial, then, by baptism with Christ can alone now put a person openly and professedly in His company.

Hence the careful reader may remark that Christian baptism is defined as burial, not death, though it is "unto death." "We are buried with Christ by baptism unto death" (Rom. vi. 4). "Buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him through faith of the operation of God, who raised Him from the dead" (Col. ii. 12). Burial with Christ, and resurrection with Him, are what that rite sets forth. It is profession, for we have thereby put on Christ. It is burial with Him unto death, so should not be mere empty profession. But no one, now on earth, can be put into the

company of Christ, except as he is baptized unto Him. And since it is as the One who died that we know Him, we are baptized unto His death. By this rite then, as Colossians teaches, we get a position we could not otherwise procure. Three points we may now see come out with distinctness. *Firstly*, We understand why those who were disciples before the cross were commissioned to baptize others, but were never commanded to be baptized themselves. They were disciples already, and were openly recognised as such, so needed not to conform to that rite. But all who professed to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ after His death could only by baptism be enrolled as disciples of Christ. *Secondly*, We see from Acts xix. that John's baptism was in no sense a substitute for Christian Baptism. And *Thirdly*, since the rite speaks of burial unto death, it neither imparts life nor salvation. Of this Simon Magus is a proof, who, though baptized, had neither the one nor the other; and the apostle, in Colossians ii. 13, makes that plain. There quickening with Christ and forgiveness are viewed as distinct from baptism. The latter has to do with position on earth before God and man. The former have to do with the Christian's standing before God. References, therefore, to such portions as John iii., Ephes. v. 26, Titus iii. 5, are quite out of place when treating of baptism. The bath or laver of regeneration has not to do with that rite. Titus iii. 5, speaks of what takes place in the soul; baptism of the position on earth into which a person is thereby brought. The water of John iii., Ephes. v. 26, is the Word of God, by which, as well as by the Spirit, the believer is begotten of God, and is cleansed from his old ways when he gives heed to what it says. Ephes. v. 26, explains that water is the Divine Word; and James i. 18, and 1 Peter i. 23, tell us we are begotten by the Word, which, we elsewhere learn, acts on the soul as water does on the body (Ps. cxix. 9; John xv. 3). Baptism, then, is not the new birth, nor regeneration, nor the means by which it is brought about. It is not the beginning of the new life, though it is properly the starting point of Christian profession. How much confusion and wrong doctrine has been introduced by mixing up profession and standing, and by attributing to all those who are in the House of God the spiritual blessings of those who are members of the Body of Christ.

We have spoken, in some measure, of what baptism is.

We would remind our readers of the connection in which it is doctrinally introduced. Where Christian standing is the subject baptism is not named. Where Christian profession, and the proper practice of a Christian are treated of, there it has its place. In Rom. iii. 5. we should look in vain for a trace of it. In chap. vi., where the Christian's walk is the subject, baptism is introduced. In Galatians iii. the apostle refers to it as a witness of the folly of their new doctrines. Would they Judaize? What had they professed by their baptism? They had put on Christ. Now in Him there was neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female. Nationalities, social position, sexual distinctions, all disappear in Christ. Why then Judaize? The ground they were taking up was diametrically opposed to all that they had professed by their baptism. In Ephesians iv. 5 it is plainly connected with profession—one Lord, one faith, one baptism. In Colossians it reminds us of the position that we have with Christ, and in 1 Peter iii. we learn how in connection with it we can have a good conscience before God. For as those saved at the flood never left earth, but were landed by its waters in a new scene, so baptism puts us in a new position without our leaving earth, and by the resurrection of Christ we have what is desired, *eiperoteema*, a goodconscience before God. In this way it saves. The salvation of those in the ark determined nothing really about their soul's everlasting condition before God. Baptism in saving us determines nothing about our soul's everlasting condition either, but, acting up to what is professed by baptism, the individual will have what he desires, a good conscience before God; "buried with Christ in baptism, wherein also he is risen with Him through faith of the operation of God who raised Him from the dead." In this way it saves; and as in the Epistles of Paul, so in that of Peter, it is introduced where walk is insisted on, not where the Christian standing is the subject in hand (1 Peter iii. 17—iv. 6). Of the soul's salvation Peter had previously written (1 Peter i. 9). One other passage there is which we have not yet noticed. Paul, in recounting before the Jews at Jerusalem the history of his conversion, gives them, what we read not of elsewhere, the word of Ananias telling him what he should do: "And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptised, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." (Acts xxii. 16). Life in his soul Saul already possessed, but as yet he had not

openly taken Christian ground. That he was to do, entering by baptism into a new position on earth, and clearing himself from all association with the past, calling upon the name of the Lord, *i.e.* openly professing to own Him whom God hath made Lord and Christ. Here, as elsewhere, baptism has to do with profession and position. It did not, it does not, confer grace. Life it cannot communicate. The soul's salvation it cannot secure. Forgiveness of sins before God it cannot procure. No external rite can affect the soul's standing before its Maker, though this rite changes the person's position on earth before God and his fellow-creatures.

PRINCIPLES CONNECTED WITH BAPTISM.

To see a little in detail the truth and principles on which baptism is based, we may begin with the fall of man. When sin had marred the beauty and innocence in which God could rest, we find a double aspect of degeneration. In man's heart, instead of love, there was inner enmity. This was succeeded by his body being removed to outward distance. Adam "was afraid," and God "drove out the man."—Gen. iii. Ever afterwards God shows that in bringing man back to Himself, or in giving him on earth communion with God, these two things—the inner enmity, and outward distance—have to be undone. We have, therefore, these two lines of truth, that which is outward, and that which is inward, running from Genesis to Revelation. What came in through the degeneration of the first man is found in the entire ways of God, till it is perfectly answered in the regeneration by the Second Man.—Matt. xix. 28, 29. Eternal redemption is not merely for the spirit, the inner thing, but also for the body, the outer thing. Creation, as linked with the body, shall also cease to groan at "the liberty of the glory of the children of God."—Rom. viii. Such are the range and scope of the principles involved in this subject of Baptism; but unless that which is outward and that which is inward are distinct in the mind, the subject, as it comes before us in Scripture, will not be clearly comprehended.

After the fall Cain and Abel seek communion with God. The outward and inward position and condition of the

worshippers are shown in what is written as to their offerings and their hearts. With Cain, who did not own by his offering that death had come in, neither the outward distance nor the inner enmity were removed. Abel, on the other hand, put death between him and God. "The Lord had respect unto Abel, and to his offering." His "more excellent sacrifice" set forth a double acceptance. Outwardly, the distance was removed; inwardly, the enmity had also been taken away. But, as we find in Scripture afterwards, the two things do not necessarily go together. Either may be and is found alone, though neither ought to be alone. Outward nearness through God's appointed ordinance brings the responsibility to answer to the outward position by inward condition of heart. But of how often the position is found without the condition answering thereto all Scripture is witness.

Having seen the principle with individuals, look at Noah's case as an example of a family or household. "He prepared an ark to the saving of his house"—Heb. xi. 7; 1 Pet. iii. 20-21. From the outward distance in the old world under judgment, through the flood he passed to the new place where he is found in outward nearness or relationship with God.—Gen. viii. 20. While "the Lord smelled a sweet savour," or had "a savour of rest," Noah had an accepted place and an accepted person, or outward position and inward condition of nearness to God. That this was true of him personally, the words "thou have I seen righteous before Me" (Gen vii 1), and "by faith Noah" (Heb. xi. 7), with the words already quoted, distinctly testify. But there were seven others who passed to the new place with him. They also had outward nearness, but one of them, Ham, acted so that he was said to be "cursed," and Noah himself "was drunken." Thus the inward reality did not always accompany the outward place of nearness. Yet of this the Spirit says—"eight souls were saved through water, which figure also now saves you, *even* baptism—1 Pet. 3, 21. The saving of the eight souls clearly refers to the position of safety and privilege to which they were brought. Baptism has thus to do with the outward place, and refers to position on earth. The inward thing which answers to the outward is "the demand, as before God, of a good conscience, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." We have seen in the case which the Spirit calls "a true likeness" the outward and the inward thing did not correspond in all, nor did even Noah long maintain the state of heart which answered

to his outward position of privilege. If the *position* had been made to depend upon the *condition*, it would have been enjoyed alone by Noah, and he also would have lost it when he lost the answering state. But with him seven others passed to the new outward place, and Noah was there even when drunken. Then, keeping the outward position and the inward condition thus distinct in the mind, and seeing that baptism is connected with the former, or *profession*, though it implies the responsibility for the latter, or *possession*, will greatly facilitate the proper understanding of the subject.

Having looked at the outward and inward things in the individual and in a household, look at them now in a nation. Israel in Egypt so resembled the Egyptians, outwardly and inwardly, that it was said "The Lord doth put a difference between the Egyptians and Israel."—Ex. xi. 7. When the Lord was about to raise the question of sin and act in judgment there was "no difference," so He "put a difference," by appointing that the blood of the Lamb should be the token, and the word of the Lord the warrant for the safety of the Israelites. There was one common outward sign, though there might be a great variety of different inward states. Some might have confidence wrought of God, while others had trembling, through yielding to their own thoughts. Others still might have the various experiences possible between these two extremes of belief and unbelief. Inwardly they were diverse indeed, though outwardly the blood on the doorposts and lintels made them the same. After the judgment in Egypt and the overthrow of Pharaoh and his host in the sea, the outward position and inward condition of Israel are even more strikingly illustrated. In the wilderness they are told "Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings and brought you unto Myself."—Ex. xix. 4. Outwardly they are brought to God, where, in privilege and responsibility, they ought to have the answering inward state. How far short they came of this, their conduct failing, and their carcasses falling, in the wilderness, plainly testify. Yet the Spirit says they "were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."—1 Cor. x. 2-3. Clearly baptism is thus connected with the outward thing—the profession,—not with the inward thing—the possession—of communion with God. The apostle's argument in 1 Cor. ix. and x. shows that a professor might be a preacher

and yet become a castaway, and that "the things happened unto Israel as types, and have been written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the ages are come. So let him that thinks that he stands take heed lest he fall." Men, women, and children, and even the mixed multitude, all passed through the sea, and were outwardly brought to God. But the inward state was so lacking that "with many of them God was not well pleased; for they were overthrown in the wilderness. But these things happened as types for us." The Spirit, therefore, puts it beyond question, by using this as an instance or illustration of Baptism, that Baptism has to do with the outward position or place of nearness, or the profession of Christianity, and at the same time shows that it brings the responsibility for inward condition of heart, the possession of life and the Holy Ghost in the soul. In being baptised in the cloud and in the sea, it was not a question of one uniform and right inward state of soul, but that of one uniform outward place of nearness of body, as brought out of Egypt unto God in the wilderness. So here, as with the eight persons saved through the waters of the flood, Baptism is attached to the outward thing, the place or ground of our standing in outward relationship with God on the earth, in nearness, privilege, and responsibility for the corresponding inward moral condition.

It may be anticipated that our next illustration of the outward and inward thing must be Christianity itself. But do not imagine that I thereby make Christianity a development of Judaism. The individual offerings of Cain and Abel were followed by the family altar of Noah. That in turn was succeeded by the brazen altar for the nation of Israel. Now that, also, has given place to the cross, the blood in heaven, the rent veil, the seated Christ, and the Holy Ghost, as a person now dwelling and working on the earth. Though as an outward system on the earth, God's relationships with Israel have been suspended for a time, it would be rash to conclude that, in the meantime, God has no outward, visible system on the earth in relationship with Himself. We find, indeed, that in the Millennial age, outward relationship with Israel will be resumed.—Rom. xi. Further, the Gentile nations will also, through Israel, be brought nigh in outward position and inward condition of blessing. What is more marvellous, after a thousand years the inward state will fail to answer to the outward standing. Deceived by the devil, nations, "the number

of whom is as the sand of the sea," will perish in rebellion against God; "fire came down from God out of heaven and devoured them."—Rev. xx. 7-10. Even in the eternal state there will be the outward and the inward thing, and there and then only, when "the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them," will the outward standing and the inward state be perfect and eternal, and He that sits upon the throne shall say, "Behold I make all things new."—Rev. xxi. 1-6. "We, according, to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."—2 Peter iii. 13. Seeing, then, that after Creation, with Israel in the past and in the future, with the nations during the Millennium, and even in eternity, there is found an outward system, need we be surprised if we find an outward system now in Christianity? Certainly not; nor have we much difficulty in discerning it in Scripture. It is often asked, in a right sense, "Are you out of system?" What is meant thereby is, "Have you got away from the mere systems of men, and been gathered unto the name of the Lord, owning all those, and only those, who are His, as the members of the one body of Christ, united to Him by the Holy Ghost?" This is right enough. It is God's inward system, the work of the Holy Ghost, now on the earth. But we must not, in avoiding what are human systems, get to the other extreme of overlooking or denying that God has also, now on the earth, as formerly with Israel, an outward system on which His name is called. It is good to be out of the systems of men. It must be better to be in the system of God if He has now such an outward visible thing on the earth. It is clear He had one in Israel, and will have one again in the Millennium, when "the Lord shall set His hand the second time to recover the remnant of His people." "He shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth."—Isa. xi. 10-12. By looking at the time God set Israel aside, and the time He will take them up again as an outward, separated people, we may see if any outward system bears God's name in the space between. That the inner reality of Christianity, through the work of the Holy Ghost, occupies this space between the dispersion and the gathering of Israel, will at once be admitted. But is there any outward form or system of God in connection with Christianity? The cutting off of Israel from the outward

place of nearness shows also that some of the Gentiles have been brought into a similar position of outward privilege and responsibility. The Apostle's argument in Rom. xi. cannot otherwise be rendered intelligible. Speaking of Israel, he says, "Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid: but, rather, through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy." Israel is temporarily set aside, and some of the Gentiles given the place from which they, in turn, will be removed to bring in Israel again, then, through Israel, all the Gentiles will, in the Millennium, be brought into the outward place of nearness and blessing. "For if the casting away of them (Israel) be the reconciling of the world (the Gentiles now brought into outward reconciliation) what shall the receiving of Israel be, but life from the dead?"—the bringing in of all the Gentiles during the Millennium. "For if the first-fruit be holy the lump is also holy; and if the root be holy so are the branches. And if some of the branches be broken off (Israel) and thou (Gentiles now in privilege) being a wild olive, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree, boast not against the branches." This clearly shows that as Israel had outward nearness to God from which they were removed, so the Gentiles now brought nigh have an outward place of blessing. What is more, root and branches are called holy. Apply this to Israel and "all are not Israel which are of Israel"—Rom. ix 6. "He is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew which is one inwardly."—Rom. ii. 28-29. Yet the "first-fruit," the "lump," the "root," and "branches" are "holy." The holiness clearly refers to their position, not to their condition, what they profess, not what they possess, in holiness. Otherwise it could not be said that "Because of unbelief they were broken off," nor that for idolatry, fornication, tempting, and murmuring, "they were destroyed by the destroyer.—1 Cor. x. 7-10. Before these things happened, as soon as they crossed the sea, the Lord is said to have guided them in His strength unto His holy habitation.—Ex. xv. 13. The whole people, the tabernacle, the oil, the garments, the vessels, are said to be holy.—Ex. xxix. 29. "Every devoted thing (man, beast, field, or possession) is most holy unto the Lord."—Lev. xxvii. 28. The connection of the people, the offering, or the

thing with the name of the Lord, gave it this outward, relative holiness. So we find when the Gentiles become branches grafted in they partake of the holiness of the root; but as Israel, though holy, was broken off, the Gentiles not abiding in the goodness of God shall also be cut off in judgment—Rom. xi. 22. That some among the Gentiles are now brought into this place of outward holy relationship, we see from the testimony of the Lord, the prophets, and apostles. “The Kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.”—Matt. xxi. 43. “Even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles.” As He saith also in “Osee, I will call them My people, which were not My people; and her beloved which was not beloved.”—Rom. ix. 24-25. Moses and Esaias are shown to have given a similar testimony.—Rom. x. 19-20. “Simon hath declared how God at first did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name.”—Acts xv. 14-16. Paul, also, at Antioch, said to the Jews, “Ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life; lo, we turn to the Gentiles. For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, ‘I have set thee to be a light to the Gentiles, that thou shouldst be for salvation unto the ends of the earth.’”—Acts xiii. 46-47. Some among the Gentiles, therefore, have now a place of privilege and responsibility as Israel had of old. The first part of 1 Cor., chs. i. to x. 14, shows conclusively that the inward and the outward things in Judaism are taken up by the Spirit to illustrate the inward and outward things, the possession and the profession, in Christianity. The address in 1 Cor. i. 1, 2, is not only to “the sanctified in Christ Jesus, called saints”—the inward thing,—but to all who call on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ in every place, both theirs and ours.” The latter is the outward thing, the profession of Christianity. So in harmony with this we find the Lord saying—“Not every one that saith unto Me, ‘Lord, Lord,’” “Many will say to Me in that day, ‘Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in Thy name? and in Thy name cast out devils? and in Thy name done many wonderful works?’ And then will I profess unto them—‘I never knew you; depart from Me ye that work iniquity.’”—Matt. vii. 21-23. This is a calling on the Lord, which is purely an outward thing, distinct from the calling resulting in the inward thing, being saved.—Romans x. 13. Also in the parable of the Virgins, with peculiar significance in this connection, those who

find the door shut say, "Lord, Lord, open unto us."—Matt. xxv. They had the outward thing—the lamp of profession, but were lacking the inward thing—the oil of the Spirit in possession. Both these cases, and such as "bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them," (1 Peter ii. 1.) are included among "all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord." Consistently, therefore, of the outward system, we have it said, in 1 Cor. iii. 7, "Ye are God's husbandry; ye are God's building."

Taking the first figure, we are reminded of, "I am the true vine, my Father is the husbandman."—John xv. 1. Israel had been the vine of profession.—Ps. lxxx. 8-16. The Lord sets aside Israel and says, "I am the vine, ye are the branches." Here is the, then, new thing on the earth in the place of Israel. It also has an outward and an inward character. There are fruitless and fruitful branches. There are those whose fruitfulness is increased, and those cast into the fire and burned. When speaking of the mere professors, the Lord says, "If a man abide not." When addressing the disciples he says, "If ye abide." Of the eleven he had said, "Ye are clean." But those who do not bring forth fruit, though grafted into the olive-tree, and called "God's husbandry," shall be cut off. After all who have inward, vital reality are caught up to meet the Lord, the outward profession will go on and become "the vine of the earth, cast into the great winepress of the wrath of God."—Rev. xiv. 19. The catching up of those who shall be ever with the Lord; the inward, vital thing given in 1 Thess. iv. 17, is followed by "taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ;" the outward, empty profession, as shown in 2 Thess. i. and ii. Till then the false and the true profess "one faith."

To follow the other figure, "God's Building," the same truths concerning the outward and inward, or the profession and possession of Christianity, are clearly revealed in Scripture. The building in 1 Cor. iii., however, ought to be carefully distinguished from the building of the Lord against which the gates of hell shall not prevail.—Matt. xvi. 18. The former, which is committed to men in responsibility, may be corrupted. The latter is in the hands of the Lord, and is incorruptible. When the Lord alone builds, other workmen are not mentioned. The same truth is found in Eph. ii. 20-21, where the stones "are built," the building "groweth," and 1 Pet. ii.

4-5, where the living stones "coming" "are built up a spiritual house." This is the inner divine thing, the Lord by the Spirit being the only builder. The fire can have no effect on this, nor shall the gates of hell prevail against it. It is the Church or Assembly which is His body."—Eph. i. 22-23. It was formed by the coming of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost. The Lord had spoken of it as a future thing, "I will build." It was now a present thing, "the Lord added to the Church daily"—Acts ii. This inner divine reality was therefore formed by the baptism of the Holy Ghost, "for by one Spirit are we all baptised into one body."—1 Cor. xii. xiii. But in contrast with this inner vital reality, we have the outer profession of Christianity spoken of as "God's building." Jesus Christ is the foundation, but men are the builders, and the Apostle gives us three examples: 1. "If any man's work abide which he hath built thereon, he shall receive a reward"—1 Cor. iii. xiv. Here is a saved workman and good work rewarded. 2. "If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he, himself, shall be saved, yet so as through fire." Here is a saved workman, but he suffers loss because his work is burned. 3. "If any man defile the Temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." Here is a workman who is lost, and his work also perishes in the fire. Hence the responsibility, "let every man take heed how he buildeth." Though the workmen, the work, and the results are diverse, it is called "God's building," as being the dwelling place of the Spirit. Of this same outward thing it is also said, "the Temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." Like Israel as a nation, and the things connected with the Lord of old, this outward profession of Christianity bears God's name, and is called holy. The force and application of the warnings in 1 Cor. ix. and x. thus become apparent. There also the connection of baptism with the profession is given: "All our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and were baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." When the outward thing thus, by the baptism of water in relationship with God, is distinguished from the inner thing in vital relationship by the baptism of the Holy Ghost, the professor, who might have been a preacher and yet became a "castaway," presents no difficulty. The things that happened unto Israel, as types for us, then take on their proper sharpness and solemnity as applied to the outward

thing, here in responsibility. To read the warnings, with the inward thing before the mind, either the warnings lose their force, or the security of the believer—the safety of what Christ is building—is threatened by the gates of hell. That the outward thing comes under judgment, the “cut off,” the “burned” branches, “the wood, hay, and stubble,” the “corrupter” destroyed, and those whose “carcasses fell in the wilderness,” all abundantly testify. The passages so perplexing to many, in John xv., Rom. xi., Heb. iii. vi.-x., 1 Cor. iii., ix., and x., 2 Pet. ii., and Jude, all refer to the outward thing, the profession. They are more easily understood, and the force of them is not lost when we see in Peter iii. 17, “that judgment must begin at the house of God.” That cannot be eternal judgment on the inner thing, or the gates of hell would prevail against the Church which Christ builds. But the outward thing failing, like Israel, in responsibility, will be “cut off”—Rom. ii. 22; “spued out”—Rev. iii. 16; “damned”—2 Thess. ii. 10-12; by a baptism of fire at the appearing of the Lord—1 Thess. i. and ii.; 2 Pet. ii.; Jude. “The same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of Man is revealed.”—Luke xvii. 29-30. This cutting off of the profession of Christianity will prepare the way for Israel being grafted in again.—Rom. xi. 23-28. But we see, both by their being broken off and their being again grafted into the place of nearness, that the outward thing, the profession of Christianity, occupies in the meantime the place of privilege and responsibility. It is quite a mistake to say that God owns no relationship on the ground of profession outside of Israel. Of the “evil servant” it is said, “The Lord of that servant shall come;” another is judged as “a wicked and slothful servant;” the husbandmen are treated as such, though “wicked men;” the virgins are spoken of as “all those virgins.”—Matt. xxiv. 45-55; xxi. 40, 41; xxv. 7-26-30; xiii. 24-33-41. The “kingdom of the heavens” is “His kingdom,” though mixed and corrupted; hence “the tribulation and kingdom and patience which are in Jesus.”—Rev. i. 9. “Kingdom of God” is applied to that in which there are “fowls” and “leaven,” as well as to what is not corrupted.—Luke xiii. 18-28. “Holy temple” is applied to what is corrupted as well as what is perfect.—1 Cor. iii. 17, Eph. ii. 21. The seven churches are

treated as churches, though having those of "the doctrine of Balaam;" and "that woman Jezebel," and what will be "spued out." The New Testament is full of the recognition of such outward, professed relationships. That which is real has an outward relationship, as well as that which is false, and outwardly they are one and the same relationship—"One Lord, one faith, one baptism." The real believer and the mere professor are, and must be, together in "a great house." The faithful man is not urged to get out of the house, but to purge himself from vessels to dishonour.—2 Tim. ii. 20. The outward relationship of the false professor cannot be said to be "unholy," and that of the true believer "holy." They are making the same profession; outwardly, "there is no difference." The profession is, therefore, "God's husbandry," "God's building," "the House of God," "the Temple of God," and is called "holy." With this outward thing is connected the baptism of water, while the inward thing, the real possession of life and the Spirit, is connected with the baptism of the Holy Ghost.

THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY GHOST.

Before considering further the baptism of water, in its relation to the House of God, it may be well to have the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, as forming the body of Christ, distinctly represented. In the lectures referred to it was shown with some detail that there are four baptisms mentioned in the New Testament. They are distinct from one another, each having its own place clearly defined. (1) There is the Baptism of John; (2) Christian Baptism, as instituted by the Lord after He had risen from the dead; (3) The Baptism of the Holy Ghost; (4) The Baptism of Fire.—Matt. iii. 11, 12; xxviii. 19. Interesting as is the latter, we must leave it, as indicated at the end of the previous paper. The two first have already been distinguished from each other, and from the third. We now go on to consider the Baptism of the Holy Ghost.

The testimony of John the Baptist concerning the Lord Jesus was twofold. "Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on Him, the same is He which baptiseth with the Holy Ghost." "And I saw and bare record

that this is the Son of God.”—John i. 33, 34. The Lord Jesus was to be revealed to John through John beholding the Holy Ghost descending and remaining on him. The one who so received the Holy Ghost was, according to John’s testimony, to baptise others with the Holy Ghost. It ought to be observed that neither in the passage quoted, nor anywhere else in Scripture, is it said that the Lord was *baptised* with the Holy Ghost. There is no Scripture to show that any individual, either before or after the man Christ Jesus ever was baptised with the Holy Ghost. The reasons are obvious, and of the utmost importance. Without understanding them, real Christian position, Christianity proper, the Church of God, the body of Christ, as distinguished from the House of God, will not be properly apprehended.

We have, first of all, to get clearly before the mind, what is implied in the fact of the *descending* of the Holy Ghost. Did the Spirit not move on the face of the waters after creation? Did the Spirit not strive with man before the flood? Was the Spirit not with Moses, Joshua, Samuel, David, Isaiah, and other kings and prophets? Most assuredly He was. Prophets and kings, like Balaam and Rezon and Hadad, may also have been stirred by the Spirit of God. From creation, down the ages, till the cross, the Spirit of God wrought on the earth. Others, besides holy men and children of God, like the tares among the wheat, were bent and swayed by the breath of His power. But never till the perfect Man was found on earth, coming up from the waters of Jordan, did the Holy Ghost make the body of a man and the earth His dwelling place. The symbol of Jehovah’s presence, the glory, had come and gone from the Tabernacle and Temple in Israel.—Ez. xi. 22, 23. Once more the glory returned. Not now in symbol, but in reality. Not behind the veil of the holy of holies, but in the body of the Man over whom heaven could open, while the Father’s voice was heard saying, “This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.”—Matt. iii. “And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us; and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.”—John i. 14. This perfect man needed no atonement, no sprinkling of blood. As in the anointing of Aaron, the type of anointing Christ with the Holy Ghost, the oil was poured upon his head, apart from any application of blood to his person.—Ex. xxix. 7-20, 21. So of Christ it was said, “Him hath God the Father sealed;” and

“Thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.”

No one ever before had thus been made the recipient of the Holy Ghost. Nor was there another till the blood of atonement had been shed, and taken by Christ Himself into the holiest of all. In prospect of the cross sins were *pretermitted*, through the forbearance of God—Rom iii. 25. But not till Christ had died and risen was the righteousness of God manifested in sins being *remitted*, and the gift of the Holy Ghost bestowed. The sons of Aaron had the blood put on the right ear, the right hand, and the great toe of the right foot, before they received the anointing oil where the blood had been first applied. So the sinner had first to stand in the efficacy of the blood of atonement before he was anointed with the Holy Ghost. Our High Priest, like Aaron, was anointed apart from blood, but He had first to shed His blood, and take it into the holiest before His own could be cleared of all charge of sin, and sealed as the righteousness of God, by the gift of the Holy Ghost. Hence we read—“It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you”—John xvi. 7. The coming of the Spirit is distinguished from all that was before as “the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven”—1 Peter i. 11, 12. Hitherto holy men may have been influenced, controlled, or, in a sense, filled with the Spirit; but except in His own person, the Man Christ Jesus, and the Holy Ghost, as a person, were not present together on the earth. The coming to the earth of the Holy Ghost as a person was made to depend on the going of the Man Christ Jesus to the throne of the Father. While He was on earth it was said, “The Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified”—John vii. 39. The difference between the past and the present dispensations is thus given by the Lord. When speaking of the Holy Ghost He said, “He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you”—John xiv. 17. Complete Christian standing is thus made to depend on two things. Before it could be known or given a Man had to take His place in heaven on the Throne of God, and God, by the Holy Ghost, had to take His place on the throne of Man’s heart on earth. This was first done, as recorded in Acts ii., on the day of Pentecost. Strictly speaking, therefore, Christianity proper commenced when a Man on the Throne of God in heaven, by sending down the Holy Ghost, united men

still on the earth to Himself on high. While the Man Christ Jesus was on the earth, His disciples had faith in Him and life from Him, but no union with Him. Union could only be in resurrection by the Holy Ghost. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die it abideth alone"—John xii. 24. As to the coming of the Holy Ghost, which was to take place at Pentecost, the Lord Jesus said, "At that day ye shall know that I am in My Father, and ye in Me, and I in you."—John xiv. 16-20. Here is union for the first time in the scriptural sense of being members of the body of Christ. Anything less is not true Christian position. "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now, if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of His."—Rom. viii. 9. "Ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular"—1 Cor. xii. 27.

When we simply think of the Lord Himself; or individual believers, it is only the *receiving*, not the *baptism*, of the Holy Ghost. On Jordan's banks—and again, in a new sense, at the right hand of God—the Lord Jesus *received* the Holy Ghost from the Father—Acts ii. 33. Looking at the occupants of the upper room at Pentecost as individuals, each and all receive and are filled with the Holy Ghost. But there is more than that which is individual. There is what is collective or corporate, and this, in the double sense of the body of Christ and the House of God. Each believer is not only, by the indwelling Spirit, united to the Head in heaven, but he is by the same Spirit united to every other believer on the earth, in whom the Holy Ghost also dwells. It is this action of the Spirit, by which all are made one with Christ on high, that Scripture calls the baptism of the Holy Ghost. In the first of Acts we have one hundred and twenty individuals in the upper room. In the beginning of the second of Acts, by the coming of the Holy Ghost, they are made one with one another, and one with Christ on high. They then form one body, of which Christ is the Head. And, as indicated by the Spirit also filling the house, the sphere where they are, is constituted the House of God by becoming the dwelling-place of the Holy Ghost. The three thousand who receive forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost also become members of that one body, and are also received into the House of God by baptism. It is true that they themselves were not fully aware of what had really taken place as to the forming of the Body, and the constituting of the House. Nor was this understood or

taught till the Apostle Paul was raised up for the very purpose of unfolding the mystery—Eph. iii. 1-12. These truths so characterize his epistles that they cannot be fully understood unless the Body and the House are apprehended. When he wrote the following words the baptism of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost, and the bringing of the Jews and Gentiles into blessing, were described as never before—“For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ; for by one Spirit are we all baptised into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been all made to drink into one spirit.”—1 Cor. xii. 12-13. This action of the Spirit should not be confounded with the being “filled with the Spirit,” whereby, now as of old, a servant may be “endued with power,” and fitted for, and carried through, special service.—Eph. v. 18; Phil. i. 19; Acts vii. 55. We observe, therefore, both at the first and now, though individuals receive the Spirit, it is only *when many individuals are made one* that there is *the baptism of the Holy Ghost*. This was done once at Pentecost, and cannot be repeated. Those at Samaria and Cæsarea, in a remarkable way, did receive the Holy Ghost. But instead of being another baptism, they were, through the apostles, linked with Jerusalem, and brought into what had already become the Habitation of God. If not in such a distinct manner, every one since then who receives forgiveness, and is sealed with the Spirit, is thereby brought into the unity formed and maintained on the earth by the coming and abiding presence of the Holy Ghost. This is the Church which is Christ’s body—Eph. i. 22, 23; iv. 15, 16. Viewed as in the mind of God, it begins at Pentecost, and terminates when the Lord comes into the air—1 Thess. iv. 14-17. As it now exists on the earth it embraces every renewed man whose body has become the temple of the Holy Ghost—1 Cor. vi. 19. This thought cuts sheer through the rubbish of ages, accumulated by creeds, confessions, or denominations, and reaches to the eternal rock on which Christ is building His Church, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail.—Matt. xvi. 18. The Lord by the Spirit adds those who thus receive vital, eternal relationship with Himself. Of this Baptism of the Holy Ghost, therefore, a risen Saviour on the throne of the Father was the administrator; the Holy Ghost was the element; renewed men on the earth were the subjects; the place where

it happened was Jerusalem; the time was the day of Pentecost; the result was the formation of the Church of God, the body of Christ, and the consummation of what was then inaugurated will be when this Church, as the bride of Christ, is caught up to meet Him coming as the Bridegroom.—1 Thes. iv. 14-17; Eph. v. 25-27. But there is, as we have seen, also an outward relationship connected with the House of God, the profession of Christianity, into which men receive others by the Baptism of water. When the scales fell from the eyes of Saul, he had peace with God, the forgiveness of sin, and was filled with the Holy Ghost. The Lord had joined him to Himself, to the Church, in eternal relationship. The Holy Ghost he had received was the bond of union.—Acts ix. 18, 19. As yet, however, he was not scripturally introduced into the House of God. He was received into this by Ananias administering the forgiveness of sins in this sense in the sight of men by the Baptism of water.—Acts xxii. 11-17.

THE CHURCH—THE HOUSE AND THE BODY.

(From Collected Writings of J. N. Darby.)

There are two points to be considered which comprehend all that with which I am at present occupied. The first is one which I have heretofore noticed, and on which the confusion and discord rest that agitate believing Protestantism; namely, the identifying the house with the body, or the outward thing here on earth (including all who profess Christianity and all baptized) with the inward thing, or that which is united to Christ by the Holy Ghost. The other is taking the figure of a building (as scripture does), and then confounding what Christ himself builds with what is the fruit of the work of building externally—here on earth entrusted to the responsibility of man.

Confusion on the first point seems to me to have been the origin of the whole system of Popery, in its leading feature; and the Reformation did not get clear of it. I mean the attributing the privileges of the body to every one who was externally introduced into the outward profession of Christianity—to every baptized person. At the beginning it was so in fact: the Lord added daily to the Church such as should

be saved. There was no principle involved in this. It was the Lord's own work; and, of course, was done really and perfectly. What He did with the spared ones at the close of the Jewish dispensation was, not to take them to heaven, as He will at the close of the present period, but to add them to the assembly which He had formed. There can be no reasonable doubt they were added outwardly by baptism, as it was the known regular way of doing so. These as introduced by the Lord, surely, had really part in all the privileges which were found in the body they were added to. The sacramental and the vital system remained undistinguished; and indeed in certain respects undeveloped, for there was no Gentile yet received, nor was the unity of the body taught. All was there that was given; for the Holy Ghost had come down, but was, as a fact, confined to Jews and Jerusalem; so that, if the nation had repented, Acts iii. might have been fulfilled as well as chapter ii. But if here all was developed, if the distinctive characters of the Church, as the unity of Jew and Gentile in one body, were not brought into evidence, all was at any rate real. The Lord, who added to the Church, brought men into the privileges which the Church possessed, and brought in those who were to possess them.

But this soon ceased to be the case. The Simon Maguses and false brethren crept in unawares, and sacramental introduction and real enjoyment of privilege became distinct. All who were introduced by baptism were not members of the body of Christ nor had really eternal life. I do not say they enjoyed no advantages. They enjoyed much every way, but it only turned to increased condemnation, and, according to Jude, they were the seed of judgment as regards the Church: of this, scripture is thus witness. Such remains as we have of the primitive Church shew that this question, or difference, was wholly lost. They contended for truth against heresy, as Irenæus; for unity, in fact, in what existed, as Ignatius (though most of what is ordinarily read of his is clearly, I judge, spurious). Both were right in the main, but that doctrine which Paul upheld with difficulty against Judaizers, and, in general, the doctrine of one body (of which Christ was the head, and those personally sealed with the Holy Ghost the members), was lost; and, in general, the rights of the body were attributed to all the baptized. I say in general, for the true privileges of the body had disappeared from their minds altogether. If they kept the great

elements of the faith, and Gnosticism (the denial of the humanity, or of the divinity, of Christ) were warded off, they were glad; while Platonism (through the means of Justin Martyr, Origen, and Clement) corrupted sufficiently within. But the effect was evident. The outward body became the Church, and whatever was held of privilege was attributed to all the baptised.

This has continued in the reformed churches. Thus, "baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven:" so Luther, so Calvin: only the latter affirming in other teachings that it was made good only in the elect; so the Scotch Church—the degree only of privilege differing. Many important consequences followed from this in Anglicans and Lutherans; such as that a person had really eternal life, was really a member of Christ, yet was finally lost. I do not dwell on these things; but the immense bearing of them is evident. Now there was a double error in thus attributing, to the external sacramental rite, the actual vital introduction into the living possession of divine privileges; and, in the utter confusion of thought which followed, the attributing the privileges of one sacrament to participation in the other.

I do not deny that the sign is spoken of as the thing signified. Christ could say, "This is my body which is broken," when it was not yet broken at all, and while He held the bread in His own hand alive; "This is the Lord's passover," when God was no longer passing over at all; "I am the true vine," and so of a thousand others. It enters into all language. I say of a picture: "That is my mother." Nobody is misled by it but those who choose to be misled. "We are buried with Christ by baptism unto death;" yet we are not buried, and we do not die: that is certain. Hence we find in scripture, in a general way, this use of language as to baptism and the Lord's Supper. Only, singular to say, we do not find the communication of life attributed to baptism, nor eating Christ's flesh, nor drinking Christ's blood, attributed to the partaking of the Lord's Supper. The nearest approach to it is the washing of regeneration.* There may be passages from which it may be sought to prove it, as John iii. and vi. (which

* "Regeneration" is not the same word as "born again," in 1 Peter i. It is a change of state, as in Matthew xix. 28; not a communication of life.

I should wholly and absolutely deny apply to the sacraments); but direct passage there is none. Baptism is used figuratively, as our burial unto death, and it may be alleged of our resurrection with Christ. Saul was called to wash away his sins; but no one is said to receive life, or be quickened therein.

Scripture recognises a sacramental system (that is, a system of ordinances) by which men are professedly gathered into a system on earth, where privileges are found. The Jewish and the Christian scriptures have both this character; but scripture carefully distinguishes personal possession of privileges from admission to the place where these privileges are. "What advantage hath the Jew? Much every way; chiefly, that unto them are committed the oracles of God." And elsewhere we have an enumeration of these privileges, which is carried on even to Christ being of them according to the flesh. But all were not Israel that were of Israel, nor were those Jews who were such outwardly.

The same is true in Christianity. In 1 Corinthians x. the apostle insists that men might be partakers of the sacraments and perish after all. And this may go very far: a person may have all the external and real privileges belonging to the Christian system and not have life. This is the case in Hebrews vi. One may speak with the tongues of men and angels, have faith to remove mountains, and be nothing. These things may be there, and "not accompany salvation." Hence, in the case of the Galatians, he stood for a moment in doubt of them, though the Spirit was ministered to them; and we have the Lord admitting that men had cast out devils in His name, yet that He had never known them (Matt. vii.). And though this, it is true, is directly connected with his sojourn on earth, one may be a branch in the vine, and be taken away.* I confirm the general truth, merely by this. In the Christian order of things, we have admission to the Christian system by ordinances recognised, and even outward privileges enjoyed—and yet no divine life or union with Christ.

But the Anglican system goes farther. It attributes to the baptized that of which baptism is not even a sign. That baptism should be a sign of Regeneration, I have no wish to deny. It is according to Scripture specifically

* "If a man," not if ye, "abide not in me" the Lord knew them, and that they were already clean.

unto death, and, in general, to the name of Christ. But it is as a sign of death, and coming up out of it may be held as resurrection; but this is individual, and has nothing to do with the body of Christ. Baptism is not even a sign of being, or being made, a member of Christ. It goes no farther than death; and at the utmost, resurrection. It is individual. I die there: I rise up again. The unity of the body has no place in it. We are baptized alone, each one for himself. But it is by one Spirit we are baptized into one body, not by water. The Lord's Supper is the sign of that: we are all one body, inasmuch as we are partakers of that one loaf. The alleging that all baptized persons have life even, is unscriptural and untrue. The ascribing the possession of vital privileges, eternal life, to them, is a fatal error, and that which leads to the judgment revealed in Jude. The attributing membership of Christ to them is not even in a figure found in baptism.

The sacraments or ordinances—for there is a sacramental system—are the earthly administrations of revealed privileges, an outward system of professed faith, and a visible body on earth. Life and membership of Christ are by the Holy Ghost. We are born of the Spirit, and by one Spirit baptized into one body. To say we are members of Christ by baptism is a falsification of the truth of God, by confounding (directly contrary to Scripture) the external admission to the earthly profession with life from God; and it is the falsification of the meaning even of the sign. It is the other sacrament, not baptism, which (even externally) exhibits the unity of the body. The Lord's Supper is in its nature received in common. The assembly or Church participate. Hence we have (Eph. iv.) "one Spirit, one body, one hope of your calling." This belongs to the Spirit and spiritual persons. "One Lord, one faith, one baptism;" such is the outward profession and faith of Christ.

The confounding the outward administration by ordinances with the power of the Spirit of God is the source of popery and apostasy. It is pitiable to see how Augustine (a truly godly man personally, who felt what life and the true Church were, when the outward thing had become grossly corrupt) writhes under the effort to conciliate the two; and quails and is bogged in his answer to the Donatists—which is none. It had been determined that the baptism by heretics was good; it was held that the Holy Ghost was given by it (another egregious blunder at any rate, as the Acts plainly shews);

consequently the Donatists had it, consequently were of the true Church. In vain Augustine seeks, flounderingly, to get out of the net he had spread for himself or got into. It required another remedy. In fact the bishops and Constantine had used other means than arguments.

Let me add here, what is not unimportant to remark, that baptism imports, not a change of state by receiving life, but a change of place. There are two things needed for fallen man. He was at enmity with God, in the mind of his flesh, and he was driven out away from God. Both these had to be remedied. We are born of God, get the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus; but the fact of having life does not change our place; we become conscious of the sinfulness of the flesh—that there is no good thing in us (that is, in our flesh); but if we bring this into the light of God's requirements, it is only, "O wretched man that I am!" A change of place, position, standing, being reconciled to God, is needed also. But that is by Christ's dying and so entering as man into a new place and standing for man in resurrection, according to the value of His work. Death has dominion over Him no more. For in that He died, He died unto sin once: in that He lives He lives unto God. Now it is of this that baptism is the sign, not of His simple quickening power as Son of God. We are baptized to His death, buried with Him unto death, that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we also should walk in newness of life. No doubt, if we are risen, we are alive; but we are quickened together with Him. Death has taken us wholly out of our old place; we have died out of it, as Christ died out of the world, and to sin; we are dead to the law by the body of Christ; we are dead to sin, have crucified the flesh, are crucified to the world. Now baptism represents death, and hence, when come out of it, a new place and standing before God—death and not quickening. We have put on Christ as in this new place, and have done with the world, flesh, and law, by death. This would be true, were but one Christian saved in the world. The unity of the body, which follows on it, is another truth. The doctrine of the Epistle to the Romans does not touch on this, though the practical part takes it up as a well-known truth.

I now turn to the building. Christ declares (in Matt. xvi.) that He will build the Church, and that the gates of hell (hades)—Satan's power, as having the power of death—shall

not prevail against it. The title given to Satan's power clearly shews what the rock was. Christ was the Son of the living God. The power of death (which Satan holds) could not prevail against that. The resurrection was the proof of it: then He was declared Son of God with power. Peter's confession of the truth revealed to him by the Father put him, by Christ's gift, in the first place in connection with this truth. The reader may remark that keys have nothing to do with the Church: people do not, as I have heretofore remarked, build with keys. Besides, the keys, those of the kingdom, were given to Peter. He had nothing to do with building: Christ was to do that. "I will build," says Christ. The Father had revealed Christ's character. On that rock Christ would build; Peter might be the first stone in importance, but no builder. Besides that, Christ has Himself ("also" refers to this: "I also," that is, besides what the Father has done) an administration to confer on Peter, that of the kingdom whose keys are given to him. But beyond all controversy, the kingdom of heaven is not the Church, though they may run parallel at the present time. Accordingly, when Peter refers to this, he does not speak of himself as building in any way. It was Christ's personal secret work in the soul carried on by Him, a real spiritual work, applicable individually and only to those who were spiritual, and, though by grace in their hearts, their own coming to Christ. "To whom coming, a living stone disallowed indeed of men but chosen of God and precious, ye also as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. Wherefore, also, it is contained in the Scripture. Behold, I lay in Zion a chief corner-stone, elect, precious, and he that believeth on Him shall not be confounded. To you, therefore, that believe He is precious;" otherwise a stone of stumbling. Now here there are no ordinances, but faith; living stones coming to a living stone. All is spiritual, personal, real. Christ is precious to faith. They have tasted that the Lord is gracious: otherwise it is not true, Peter does not build, nor any other instrument. They come by faith and are built up. Against this, most assuredly, the gates of hades will not prevail; but man's building has nothing to say to it. The body or membership of the body forms no part of Peter's revelation. Nor does he speak of the Church or assembly at all.

Let us now turn to Paul. He is full upon this question. He was a minister of the Church to fulfil or complete the word of God. Hence the doctrine of the Church as the body of Christ is fully developed by him. In Ephesians i.—iv., in 1 Corinthians x., xii., in Romans xii., in Colossians, we have large and elaborate instruction on the subject; but of course there is no talking of building a body. Christ is risen to be the Head of the body. In Colossians i. He is exalted to the right hand of God. And God has given Him, in that position, to be Head to the body which is His fulness who fills all in all. Christ has reconciled both in one body by the cross. And, as to its accomplishment, it is by the baptism of the Holy Ghost: by one Spirit we have been all baptised into one body. And, further, when he speaks of the building in its true perfect adjustment, he has no instrumental builder either. "Ye are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord." This, though somewhat differently viewed, is Peter's building. We may find the same in Hebrews iii., Christ's house, "Whose house are we." But Paul speaks in a different way elsewhere, and shews us the house raised by human instruments, a public ostensible thing in the world. "Ye are God's husbandry, ye are God's building. According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise master-builder I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereon." And then he shews the effect of fidelity or infidelity in the work. Now in this we have the responsibility of man, and the instrumentality of man directly engaged in the work. Christ is not the builder. Paul is the master-builder and lays the foundation which is Christ; others build on it; nor is the building, consequently, fitly framed together. Wood and hay and stubble are not fitly framed in a building with gold and silver and precious stones: the work is, in such case, to be burned up: Christ's work never will. Now this gives, evidently, another character to the Church than that of Matthew xvi. or 1 Peter ii.

It is on this confusion and error that Popery, Puseyism, and the whole high-church system is built. They have not distinguished between the building which Christ builds, where living stones come to a living stone, where all grows to a holy

temple in the Lord (that is, where the result is perfect), and that which man avowedly builds, though as God's building, and where man may fail and has failed. I am entirely justified at looking at the outward thing in this world as a building, which in pretension, character, and responsibility is God's building; yet it has been built by man, and built of wood and stubble, so that the work is to be burned up in the day of judgment which is revealed in fire. Yea, more, I may see that corrupters have corrupted it; and that, if any have dealt with it in this character, they will be destroyed. In a word I have a building which Christ builds, a building in which living stones come and are built up as living stones, a building which grows to a holy temple in the Lord. I have also what is called God's building, as that which is for Him and set up by Him on the earth, but which is built instrumentally and responsibly by man, where I may find very bad building and even persons corrupting it. The foundation well laid, and a good foundation, but all the superstructure to be in question. Thus the whole professing Church stands in the position and responsibility of God's building; the actual building or work is the work of men and may be wood, hay, and stubble, or the mere corruption of the corrupter. It is not that of which Christ says, "I will build." It would be a blasphemy to say that He builds with wood, hay, and stubble, or corrupts the temple of God. Yet such the apostle tells us may take place; and it has taken place; and he who sets the title of God upon the wood, hay, and stubble, or upon the wicked corruption of His temple, dishonours God by putting (as far as they are concerned) His seal and sanction upon evil, which is the greatest of wickedness. What our path in such a case is, Paul (2 Tim. ii.) tells us; but it is not my object to pursue this here, but to distinguish between those admitted by baptism and the body; and between the Church which Christ builds, and what man builds when God's building is entrusted to him. All that has been entrusted to man, man has failed in. And God has put all into his hands first, to be set up perfect in the second Man who never fails.

DISCIPLES—CHRISTIANS ; BELIEVERS— BRETHREN.

An important illustration of the outward and inward things in the system of Christianity, and what is helpful in understanding the Commission in Matt. xxviii., will be found in the distinction between *disciple* and *believer*. A disciple is, strictly speaking, a learner and a follower. In profession he accepts the tenets of his teacher, and openly takes his place with him in the sight of men. As he may cease to learn and follow, the connection is one of outward relationship. While it lasts there is company or association. It does not imply that there is a common life or vital union. There is the profession of a faith in the sense of accepting certain doctrines. It does not necessarily import the possession of the living faith which accompanies a change of heart and the salvation of the soul. This latter is the *inward* thing, and describes a *believer*. The former is the outward thing, connected with being a *disciple*. Both may be found together; yet each may be found alone. Disciple implies outward association in the sight of men. Believer imports inward life from, and acceptance with, God. The one, rather, indicates position of body; the other, condition of soul. The one is man-ward, earth-ward, for time; the other is God-ward and heaven-ward for time and eternity. Three times in John vi. 60-71, the followers of the Lord are called "His disciples," yet He said to them, "There are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were who believed not, and who should betray Him." They were *disciples*, though not true *believers*. "From that time many of his disciples went back and walked no more with Him. Then said Jesus unto the twelve, Will ye also go away?" The eleven were believers, as well as disciples. Judas was a disciple, but not a believer. "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil. He spake of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon; for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve." Disciple is thus seen to be connected with what is outward, with profession. Believer has to do with what is inward, with possession. Strictly speaking, therefore, Christian is the outward thing, though it is so habitually used for the inward thing. "The disciples were called Christians first at Antioch." There are exceptions in Scripture to this use of the terms disciple and believer. It is said that many believed in His name, when they saw the

miracles He did. "But Jesus did not commit Himself unto them."—John ii. 23-25. Simon the sorcerer "himself believed also," yet he was "in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity."—Acts viii. There is a dead faith which may believe that there is one God, and the devils also believe.—Tim. iii. 17-20. In such cases believing does not imply an inward change of heart, but that an outward faith is true. In the following we have believer applied to the outward, and disciple to the inward thing:—Jesus said to those Jews which believed on Him, "If ye continue in My word, then are ye My disciples indeed" (or "truly My disciples").—John viii. 31. Here the terms are used in such a way as to render their ordinary use all the more distinct. Discipleship has to do with the profession, the path, the walk before men. "Whosoever doth not bear his cross and come after Me cannot be My disciple."—Luke xiv. 27. Connected with discipleship, also, we have responsibility, testimony, fruitfulness and reward. "Herein is My Father glorified that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be My disciples."—John xv. 8.

We observe that the thoughts in Scripture connected with the body and conduct on the earth run in the same line of truth. "Let not sin reign in your mortal body." "Yield your members as instruments of righteousness unto God."—Rom. vi. 12, 13. "Present your bodies a living sacrifice."—Rom. xii. "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost." "Glorify God in your body."—1 Cor. vi. 19, 20. Paul said, "Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life or by death."—Phil. i. 20. "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body."—2 Cor. v. 10. For special sins Ananias and Sapphira, and certain Corinthians, were judged, or lost the lives of their bodies. "For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep. For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged."—1 Cor. xi. 30, 31. Thus, though discipleship be the outward thing, having to do with the body, profession, fruitfulness, and walk on earth, its responsibilities can only be properly answered by the inward thing in the believer, who, in the energy of grace, is sustained in communion and moral nearness to his Lord. Paul says, "I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection." In him, through grace, we find the outward and the inward thing, the path of the disciple, and the burning love of the believer, in beautiful harmony. "We have this treasure in earthen

vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not from us." "Always bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our body."—2 Cor. iv. 7-10. He could say, "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ."—1 Cor. xi. 1. With Paul there was still something to be attained. The perfect Nazarite, the Man Christ Jesus, had nothing to attain. In all His path on the earth, He could say to the Father, and the Father could say to Him, "that it was well pleasing."—John viii. 29; Matt. iii. 17; xvii. 4. In separation, in subjection, in service, and in suffering, He was perfect, leaving us an example, "that ye should follow in His steps." This is the goal set before the disciple. He is put in the *place* from which the path leads to the goal by being baptised *unto* Christ. When the eunuch knew that the prophet spake of Jesus, and that "His life is taken from the earth," he wanted to be in His company.—Acts viii. 33. He had learned quickly and clearly how baptism sets forth, by burial in water, that death and judgment were due to the life in the flesh, and all the scene with which it had been connected. The Lord had passed off the scene, putting death between Himself and all in nature by dying unto sin once, and living unto God.—Rom vi. 10. The eunuch, desiring to learn and follow Christ as a disciple, through baptism, as the symbol of Christ's death, is made to pass off the scene and take his place with the Risen One, that he also may live "in newness of life." Christ is not now on the earth; He lives on high, and desires that others should express Him here during His absence. In place of the One who has gone, as when one falls in the ranks in battle, the disciple is baptised for the dead—the Christ who has died—that in him, still on the earth, may be manifested anew the life that was taken from the earth.—1 Cor. xv. 29; Phil. i. 20, 21. The end to be reached is, "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me."—Gal. ii. 20.

Is it not needful to lift this subject of baptism out of the ruts, and raise it from the low level and the narrow sphere in which it has been followed? How much better to look at the subject as seen in its principles in all Scripture, and the answer to its practice in the bright light of the path of the peerless Man Christ Jesus! Baptism will then mark the *place* where the disciple, in an outward way, commenced to keep company with his Lord, from which, through inward answering grace, like Elisha, having seen Elijah taken up, he begins

to tread the path, to do the kind of works, and once more manifest on the earth the life of the Man who has gone on high. But "if some did not believe, shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid: yea, let God be true, but every man a liar."

Outward place may be, and is, given by baptism; but unless the disciple is a believer, no real answer on the earth can be produced to the Risen One. There is a difference between the place given and the state of the disciple who may be in it, as we saw with Israel brought to God, and yet overthrown in the wilderness. To be in Christ's *company* is one thing; to be *risen* with, and *in*, Him is another. Strictly, baptism gives the former; it does not even set forth the latter. That depends upon the "faith of the operation of God." The state of the disciple's heart and his standing before God is a matter between himself and God. But as a disciple, to be true to his profession, he ought to express Christ in the sight of men. The life of Jesus ought to be manifest in his body.—2 Cor. iv. 10. Discipleship is, therefore, strictly speaking, an outward relationship. It is what men and God see of Christ in the walk and ways of one who professes to be learning and following Christ. Hence the quick-witted people of Antioch, going by what was seen and heard, first called the disciples Christians. The important bearing of the terms disciples and Christians, as primarily expressing what is outward, in contrast to the terms believers and brethren, as expressing what is inward, will be seen when we consider the commission for baptism. No doubt the former terms are often used when the latter thought is meant to be expressed, but, strictly speaking, in connection with the baptism of water persons are disciples or Christians; as joined to the Lord and one another, by the baptism of the Spirit, they are believers or brethren. The former links them with the whole house of God; the latter, with the one body of Christ.

THE COMMISSION TO BAPTISE.

In coming to look at the commission to baptise, the place and circumstances in which it was given by the Lord are important. His life had been taken from the earth. He had died out of the sphere of sin and Satan's power. None in that sphere had now, on the ground of nature, any claim on,

or link with, Him. As the risen Man He is Lord, with all power on earth, power over all flesh.—Matt. xxviii. 18; John xvii. 2. “To this end Christ died, and rose, and revived, that He might be the Lord both of the dead and the living.”—Rom. xiv. 9-12. God has ordained that the name and claim of the Lordship of Christ shall be owned in heaven, in earth, and under the earth, and “that every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord.”—Phil. ii. 10, 11. As one who had such authority, standing amid His disciples on the mountain side in Galilee, He commissioned them to go to the nations, that they might own His claims as Lord. That He can be owned as Lord in an outward way, apart from there being any saving work in the soul, is clear from the fact that “things under the earth” (infernal beings) shall confess Him as Lord. But before His claim shall be urged by power, from the new place He occupies as the Risen Lord, He sends forth to the nations the testimony of His grace, that they may so call upon, and confess, Him as Lord as to find salvation.—Rom. x. 9-13.

In Mark we find a commission for preaching the Gospel to every creature.—Mark xvi. 15. Luke gives us the character of the preaching, and the direction to begin at Jerusalem.—Luke xxiv. 47. Matthew alone gives us the commission to baptize.—Matt. xxviii. 19-20. In Mark baptism is mentioned incidentally along with believing. But this is not intended to add to the commission in Matthew, which is complete in itself, and forms the only commission for baptising. The distinction between disciple and believer, noticed in a previous paper, will help us to understand the import of the commission as it might not otherwise have been grasped. At the outset it ought to be carefully observed that the commission is given to *disciples*. They are not called apostles or even believers. Both were present, yet the Spirit avoids mentioning either the one thought or the other in all the three Gospels. They are called “the eleven disciples,” “the eleven,” and “the eleven and them that were with them,” in connection with receiving the commission for preaching and baptising.—Matt. xxviii. 16, Mark xvi. 14, Luke xxiv. 18, 33, 48. Cleopas and others were present besides apostles when the promise of the Father was given and received.—Acts i. 15; ii. 1-4. The commission and the power were wider in their application than the Lord’s “having charged the apostles whom He had chosen.” (Exact version).—Acts i. 2. There was indeed something which was given peculiarly to the

apostles. The keys of the kingdom were given to Peter, for instance, in a special manner, though others ultimately remit or retain sins (John xx. 23); but there is both wisdom and significance in the fact that the commission for what was distinctly an outward ordinance was given expressly in connection with an outward relationship. To His followers, not as apostles or believers, but as *disciples*, the Lord gave the commission to *disciple* all nations—"Go ye and disciple all nations, baptising them." It is not said that they were to make believers; nor in the commission is there a word as to believing being a condition of being baptised. No one would wish faith to be absent, but the point is that the commission is for *disciplining* the nations, not for making *believers*. The former is an outward thing, and can be entrusted to men: the latter is an inward thing, which the Father keeps in His own power.—John vi. 37, 44. The nearest approach to any one receiving a commission to accomplish an inward work in the soul is that given to Paul. He is also sent to the nations "to open their eyes, that they may turn from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive remission of sins."—Acts xxvi. 18. In this, the correct reading of Paul's commission, we see how he might open their eyes by bringing the nations light; but it does not say that he was to, or could, *turn* them from darkness to light, or *cause* them to be forgiven. The turning and remission are wholly in the hands of the Lord. Paul or Apollos might perform work or bear testimony, but the increase is all ascribed to God.—1 Cor. iii. 7. There is no such thing as a commission to make believers; nor is there even the mention of faith as a condition when the Lord sends disciples to "disciple all the nations, baptising them." But the outward work of disciplining is committed to them in the commission.

It should be observed that if what is thus given by the Lord is thought of as a command for baptism, it is a command to those who are to *baptise*, not to those who are to *be* baptised. This latter is frequently urged, and John's baptising Jesus given as an example for us to follow, and so "fulfil all righteousness." The thought confuses John's baptism with Christian baptism. It also presumptuously assumes that we are on a level with Christ as the Sent of God. Who can begin like Him, without any sins to confess? This taking of Christ as an example for us to follow in baptism supposes

that we are neither fallen in Adam nor dead in sins. It puts us under law instead of grace. It is the error Paul corrected among the Galatians when he wrote, "If righteousness came by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." It is true that the commission, apart from taking the form of a command to the *subject*, shows clearly that persons ought to be baptised; but when we do speak of it as a command, it is to the *baptiser*, not to the *subject* of baptism. When Peter or Ananias say, "be baptised" to the subject, they are obeying the command given to *themselves*, rather than urging one previously given in the commission to the *subjects* of baptism—Acts ii. 38.; xxii. 16. It is, however, frequently urged in favour of "Believer's Baptism," as against infant or household baptism, that in the two latter the individuals do not act for themselves in being baptised. The thought arises from it being assumed that baptism is a command to the subject of it, and that each must obey it for himself. A little careful consideration of what has been stated will remove the difficulty. If baptism is a command for the subject to obey as such, why should the eunuch have said "What doth hinder me to be baptised?"—Acts viii. 36. Take, for instance, the command, "Honour thy father and thy mother." Why should a child say, "What doth hinder me from obeying my parents?" The only hindrance there can be lies with himself, in his own will. In the other case the eunuch was willing himself, and he was asking what hindered in the will of Philip. This shows clearly that the action was to be Philip's, and that the command came to him as the baptiser, rather than to the eunuch as the subject of baptism. This is confirmed by the question of Peter regarding those in the house of Cornelius. "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptised?"—Acts x. 27. The hesitation, or the hindrance, is referred to as possibly existing in the minds of *others*, not in the minds of *those* to be baptised. It is not a question of obedience on the part of the latter, but reception into a place of privilege on the part of the former. Then, if another has baptised me, as an adult, or even as an infant, he has carried out the *only* command, and there is not another command for me to obey in being baptised. The commission does not say to believers, as such, "be baptised," nor to the disciples, "baptise one another," but it does say to disciples, "Go and disciple all nations, baptising them."

These words are often rendered correctly enough, "make

disciples, baptising them," in order to prove that the subjects of baptism ought *first* to become disciples and *then* be baptised as believers. Without troubling ordinary readers much with Greek words or textual criticism, I may try and give in English what is very clear and forcible to any one who deals fairly with the words of the commission as they stand in the Greek. The point at issue, in the first instance, is simply whether the pronoun *them* in the commission refers to *disciples* or to *nations*. Some have confidently quoted *them* in Greek to prove by its masculine termination that it is in concord with disciples, not neuter as agreeing with nations, saying that if *them* applied to nations it would have been *auta*, whereas it is *autous*. This looks plausible, and may pass with those who do not know Greek, or such as might not bear in mind that the pronoun in question, in respect of *gender* and *number*, often follows the rule of rational concord, or the construction required by the sense. I could quote from a standard grammar where the very words before us are given as an example of this agreement according to the sense, and the pronoun *them* is specially pointed out as referring to *nations*. See also, "over *them*," Col. ii. 15; and "unto *her*," Mar. v. 41.

Further reference to the Greek is fatal to the other supposition, that "them" applies to disciples. The Greek for "make disciples" is not, as in English, a verb and a noun, but a simple verb of one word like "teach," meaning, when accurately rendered, *disciple*, in the verbal sense of acting upon an object, in this case the nations. The term disciples as a noun is not in the verse in Greek at all. Accurately rendered, the commission reads, "Go, disciple all the nations, baptizing them to the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you. And behold I am with you all the days till the completion of the age." We thus see that disciples as a noun is not in the verses, but the noun *nations* is there, and the pronoun *them* twice applies to *nations*. The disciples were to baptise and teach the nations. Thus the argument, so essential to "believer's baptism," of *first* making disciples, and then baptising them as believers, is disposed of absolutely. It has no foundation in the words of the *only* commission to baptize.

Again, the way in which the commission makes "baptising" and "teaching" link with, and depend upon, "discipling" forbids that the discipling, baptising, and teaching should be taken

as *three* distinct, independent actions, as frequently represented. The words do not read, "disciple all nations, and baptise and teach them," but "disciple, baptising teaching." Take other examples. Paul says, "I persecuted this way unto the death, binding and delivering into prisons both men and women."—Acts xxii. 4. The Jews "spake against those things which were spoken by Paul, contradicting and blaspheming."—Acts xiii. 45. In all the three cases we have first the general action expressed by a simple verb, and then other two modes of the same action expressed by participles. The participles are, in the three cases, given without the article in Greek, and are instances of the rule by which a participle without the article, and in grammatical concord with the subject of the verb, stands as adjunct to the verbal predicate, *setting forth the mode in which the given action was performed*. Instead of there being three independent actions, therefore, in each verse, we have *one action* and then *two modes*, in which it was performed. The "contradicting and blaspheming" were two modes of speaking against what Paul said. The "binding and delivering" were two modes in which Saul persecuted. So the "baptising and teaching" were two modes by which they were to disciple the nations. The passages are the same as to construction, leaving no room for question as to the *manner* of carrying out the commission. Instead of making disciples, and then baptising and teaching them after they were made, they were to *do* the discipling by baptising and teaching the nations. The baptising would not be done apart from instruction or testimony concerning Christ and the meaning of the ordinance; nor would baptising without the teaching enjoined afterwards, be thorough discipling. But the "baptising" is evidently connected with the commencement, the "teaching" with the continuation," of the path of the disciple. The two-things are needful, and give us unquestionably the *two-fold mode* of properly fulfilling the commission for *discipling* the nations.

The thought that disciples, through preaching, are to make disciples, and then baptise them after they are made, is more akin to the very opposite thought than what is taught in Scripture. It puts the cart before the horse. Disciple is assumed to mean the inner thing, wrought in the soul by the Holy Ghost. Baptism is conceived to be the witness to, or the confession of, this vital change. It would, according to this view, be possible to own, and indeed

be the proper practice of recognising, persons born of God as *disciples* before, or altogether apart from, baptism. But is this what we find in Scripture? Certainly not. We rather find that as to acceptance with God, having eternal life, being sealed with the Spirit, and safe for eternity, all may be true and real with a person, yet Scripture does not *own* him as a *disciple*, or a *Christian* unless he is baptised. The reason is obvious. Baptism has not to do with salvation or eternity. It is connected with time and position on earth. The former, as just described, is the inner thing connected with the person being a *believer*, and having acceptance in the sight of God. Scripture, as we have seen, connects the latter, the being a disciple or a Christian, with the outer thing, and a person's being known as a learner and a follower of Christ in the sight of men. From what was seen and professed, "the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch." This profession was made, this position was given, and the path of the disciple properly only commenced, or ought to have commenced, when he was baptised. If it was a mere profession, this could not alter the outward place into which the person was thereby brought, any more than the unbelief, the failure, or the sin of a Jew could render him other than a Jew outwardly, as recognised in his circumcision. "For what if some did not believe? Shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid." Simon Magus might be in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity, yet he had been made a disciple, and had put on Christ outwardly by baptism. But where one may be a true *believer*, and is not baptised, he is not owned as a *disciple* till he has, through this ordinance, been put outwardly in the sight of men in company with the risen Lord in the new place. "*Whoever doth not bear his cross, and come after Me, cannot be My disciple.*" Hence the force of the words of the Lord—"He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved." So also the point of Peter's words at Jerusalem—"Repent, and be baptised, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," and "save yourselves from this untoward generation." "The like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save you." Ananias also said to Saul—"Now, why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptised, and wash away thy sins." As a believer and towards God he was right already, but to be a disciple in the sight of men he must break the link with the past, and outwardly take the new place and the new path by being baptised

unto Christ's death. Instead of the Lord having made him a disciple, and Ananias having baptised him as such already, the Lord made him a believer, and Ananias made him a disciple by baptism. What the Lord had in view, therefore, was not that the disciples should make believers, and own them, and baptise them as disciples; but in the commission. He expressly enjoined, and the apostles practised, *discipling by means of baptising and teaching the nations*. The common objection, forcible to many, that in the households said to be baptised, there is no mention there or anywhere else in Scripture of children being baptised, is thus more than answered when we find that the only commission for baptism was for baptising nations. There are children in them. But this subject, and the ground or warrant for the act of baptising will come before us in other papers.

There is no record of the disciples, to whom the commission was given, having carried it out to the nations. It has not been set aside however, nor do we find any other commission to baptise. John's baptism was superseded by Christian baptism, but we do not find that which was committed to the eleven set aside by any other baptism. Though so much in a special way regarding the Church was committed to Paul, he not only does not receive anything fresh about baptism, but says, "Christ sent me not to baptise, but to preach the Gospel."—1 Cor. i. 17. He shows, however, that he did baptise; that he recognised that the commission stood unrepealed, by giving baptism its place, without either ignoring or magnifying the ordinance. He was sent to the Gentiles (nations), and was thus linked with what was contemplated by the commission given to disciples.—Rom. xv. 15-17; Acts xxvi. 16-18. The three chief apostles recognised his mission, and agreed that Paul and Barnabas "should go to the nations, and they to the circumcision."—Gal. ii. 7-9. So the sphere enlarges and the labourers multiply as Paul associates others with him in the work, and charges Timothy, "the things that thou hast heard of me, among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also." Thus, through the mercy and faithfulness of the Lord, amid so much dishonouring to Him, the mission of His grace to the nations has, in some sense, proceeded, and that bracing promise given to and for disciples ever has been, and will remain, true for faith—"Behold, I am with you all the days till the completion of the age."

SCRIPTURAL BAPTISM WIDER THAN BELIEVER'S BAPTISM.

Is what is called Believer's Baptism strictly Scriptural? The question may seem a bold one. The name "Believer's Baptism" is quite as uncompromising if it is looked at closely. If "Believer's Baptism" is strictly Scriptural, no other baptism is Scriptural. If not so stated that is what is implied. Nearly every one admits that the baptism of believers, if they have not been baptised before, is Scriptural. But "Believer's Baptism" means that immersion in water, in the name of the Trinity or the Lord Jesus, of a child, an adult, or a professor, is not baptism unless the subject of it be a true believer. If the person believed afterwards he, according to this, would need to be baptised again. The believer, what he is, or has, or what is in him, through the work of the Spirit, is asserted as the reason, ground, or warrant for his being baptised. If there was not any real, inward, vital change in his nature the ceremony would not be baptism, for everything is made to turn or depend on the subject being a true believer. Is this what Scripture teaches? The case of Simon the Sorcerer answers in the negative—Acts viii. His believing may have credited the miracles and signs to a superhuman power, but a real inward change it did not produce. He was soon told "Thy heart is not right in the sight of God." "Thou art in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity." The thought that in the meantime Simon had fallen away needs no answer to any simple Christian who believes that eternal life means eternal life and nothing else. Though not a true believer, Scripture says Simon "was baptised." According to the thought of "Believer's Baptism," when it was proved that he was not a real believer it would not have been called baptism. All had come out before the Spirit put the facts on record, and there is not the shadow of a suggestion that, although Simon was a hypocrite, what he submitted to should be called anything else than baptism. But it was not Believer's Baptism. That term and the thoughts implied in it are therefore narrower and more exclusive than Scripture. Consequently, "Believer's Baptism," as it is commonly taught and understood, is not the only Scriptural baptism. The case of Simon shows that the Spirit gives the term baptism a wider meaning than when applied to a true believer. This is confirmed by the other Scripture, "All passed through the sea :

and were all baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."—1 Cor. x. 1-2. From what follows regarding their being "overthrown in the wilderness," it is clear that the Spirit applied the term "baptised" in a wider sense than that which was connected with believing or a right inward state of soul. We found a similarly wide meaning attached to baptism in examining the commission to baptise the nations.

But does Scripture connect baptism with an inward state of soul? As "Believer's Baptism" implies, does Scripture teach that Baptism wholly depends upon, and is a witness to, a right inward state? To be clear on the real point at issue, I repeat, is it that a person is a true believer, what he is in himself, or has, as eternal life, or what is in him through the work of the Spirit, that is to be ground, reason, cause, or warrant for his being baptized? For this I want Scripture. If it can be produced, then Believer's Baptism is Scriptural. I must bow to the Word, and would desire to go with the teaching with all my heart, saying with the Eunuch, "What doth hinder me to be baptized?" "Philip said, if thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God."—Acts viii. 37. These words, I admit, answer my questions most distinctly in the affirmative. They clearly make baptism to depend upon believing, and a right inward state of soul. Grant that they are the words of the Holy Ghost, and the whole question is settled. Every one who is subject to Scripture must then accept Believer's Baptism as scriptural. But I ask, are the words Scripture at all? Give me another single verse from the New Testament which explicitly expresses the same thought, making baptism absolutely depend upon believing. It is not denied that in the majority of cases of baptism the subjects were believers. What is wanted is another verse from Scripture which as distinctly makes *believing* the ground or warrant for baptism. I have sought and asked in vain for such a verse. There is not another verse in the Book which expresses exactly the same thought.

Let us look at some of the texts most frequently quoted, which are supposed to do so. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned."—Mark xvi. 15-6. This clearly makes being saved depend on belief and baptism. That is quite a different thought from making baptism depend on believing, as the other verse does. The words are often thought of and quoted

as if they read, "Believe and be baptized," or, "He that believes and is then baptized." That thought may be in the minds, or in the mouths of many, but it is not in Scripture. The verse is also quoted as a perfect proof that belief *must* precede baptism. No one would plead that that is not desirable in adults; but the words in question do not prove that believing must be first in order of time; if anything, they are stronger the opposite way. Grant that a person is baptized and then believes, it could be said most emphatically, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." But the real question raised in the verse is not a question of belief and baptism, it involves salvation or damnation. It does *not* say, "he that believeth not shall not be baptized." The verse *does* say, "He that believeth not shall be damned." It is urged that infants cannot believe, and should not be baptized. Then, as the verse unequivocally connects damnation with believing not, you must go on to say, infants cannot believe, therefore infants cannot be saved. Who is prepared to accept that conclusion except such as pervert the truth? Yet this is the conclusion to which we are forced by the reasoning which makes the passage teach that baptism depends on believing; or, as it is often put, "first belief, then baptism, then salvation." This reasoning denies equally the baptism and salvation of infants; but it is all brought to, not what is in, this Scripture? It is not a commission to baptise at all. Baptism is mentioned incidentally. We have only the one commission for baptism.—Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

The real force of Mark's words is doubtless that as the cross and rejection of, and for, Christ had come in, some might wish to avoid the cross and rejection, and be secret disciples. The Lord would have every one who believed in Him to own Him openly, and become a witness for Him, or he was not to be considered, or in the face of this Scripture could he consider himself, on the way to final salvation.—Matt. x. 32, 33. This is a very different thought than saying as to being baptized, "If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest."

When they of Samaria "believed Philip preaching * * * they were baptized, both men and women."—Acts viii. 12. This is often quoted to prove that belief must precede baptism. As to baptizing such as hear the Gospel for the first time and believe it, we are at one with those who teach "Believer's Baptism." But this case, or indeed any case in Scripture, is not a perfect example of what we have now in

Christendom. To make them the same you must put us into the same circumstances. That cannot be. We are near the end rather than the beginning of the age. But it is remarkable, in this case at the beginning, that the only name given is that of Simon, who was not a true believer. He was a mere professor. We are not told that every one of the others who "believed also," was right at heart. The passage therefore teaches that baptism depends on *professing* rather than true *believing*. It favours professor's baptism more than "Believer's Baptism." It gives confession with the mouth, rather than believing with the heart, as the warrant for being baptized.

"Many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptised."—Acts xviii. 8. This is often given as a proof of correct order, and that baptism depends upon believing. It states clearly what took place as matters of fact. It does not necessarily prove the other points. The Corinthians could not believe, nor would they have been baptised, without having heard about Christ and what was implied in baptism. Though they did believe and were baptised, this does not necessarily connect baptism with the state of their hearts, or make it a witness to their having undergone a certain experience. If this is one's habit of thinking, he will read the verse and see it there, but this Scripture, like most in the Acts, is a plain statement of facts, rather than anything from which one would deduce doctrines. It gives us an *effect*, while what we are inquiring for is a *cause*. We want the cause or ground of baptism, and we only find here what accompanied the effect. If any cause is given, it is rather the "hearing" than their having "believed." This would give a conclusion and a doctrine which few would accept, "If thou hast *heard* thou mayest be baptised."

Again it is written, "Then they that gladly received his word were baptised."—Acts ii. 41. Here it is thought that the receiving of the Word is clearly the cause of being baptised. Still, I urge that what is stated is rather an effect than a cause. The being baptised did not necessarily follow the receiving of the word. It could have been received without baptism. The reason for baptism and the act of the one who baptised arose, not so much from the *subjects* of baptism, but from the *agent* of baptism having received a word.—Matt. xxviii. 19. But, apart from that, what was the word which those baptised received? It is often assumed, and confidently

stated, that it was what is known as the Gospel. We are not left, however, to surmisings. "Peter said unto them, repent, and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." The Spirit thus gives us "his word," which they received. That word urged repentance and baptism, and held out remission and the gift of the Holy Ghost as results which would follow. It is true that Peter was here speaking of the *administration* of forgiveness in connection with the house of God; but if they had *actual* forgiveness when he spoke, why urge them to repent? This about repentance, however, was in "his word," which they received, and if the passage gives the cause or ground of baptism, it is rather receiving a word about repentance than the having believed with all the heart. It is penitent's baptism rather than "Believer's Baptism," as forgiveness was to follow.

By examining other passages where believing and being baptised come together, we would be equally unsuccessful in finding one of them giving the exact thought as to the cause or warrant for baptism as expressed in the words, "If thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest." Then ought these words to be in Scripture? The weight of manuscript evidence, and the judgment of those most competent to determine, are decidedly against them. The verse is left out in the Revised and other versions of repute. We may therefore conclude that it is not Scripture. It cannot be accepted as the sole authority for making baptism depend, as to its cause or warrant, on believing with the heart. There is another thought in the verse which goes far in proving that it ought not to be in Scripture. The statement, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God," is out of place in that part of the Acts Peter had made that confession (Matt. xvi. 16); but neither he nor any other, even after the coming of the Holy Ghost, had as yet preached that truth. It was to be the foundation of the Church, and, appropriately, it was left for Paul, to whom, peculiarly, Church truth was committed, to be the first to preach that Christ was "the Son of God."—Acts ix. 20. Paul was not yet converted when the Eunuch was talking with Philip. From internal and manuscript evidence, and the fact that no other Scripture gives the exact thought, we must conclude that what is given as Philip's statement as to believing being the warrant of baptism, is not only not Scripture, but it is not truth. There the statement is, how-

ever, in the Authorised Version and ancient manuscripts, a witness to the startling fact that the real truth regarding baptism was lost near the beginning, as were the distinctive truths of Paul's teaching concerning the new creation, the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and the Church as the body of Christ. Through the thought which man or the enemy introduced in the verse in question no end of controversy and confusion have come into the House of God. The truth as to the baptism of water is as much recovered truth as is that concerning the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. Many have been led to see and act upon the latter in owning the one body of Christ who have not so seen the former in its relation to the House of God. To find the truth, and literally with simplicity to carry out the practice of what is involved in both baptisms, will land one outside every denomination in Christendom. The recognition of the baptism of the Holy Ghost implies the owning of the one body of Christ. "We being many are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another."—Rom. xvi. 5. If I profess this and yet continue a member of another body, or denomination, which may *include* many not true believers, as it must *exclude* many believers in other denominations, I am in practice denying the one body of Christ. A person is not strictly speaking a member of two denominations at the same time, neither can a believer rightly own in practice that he is a member of the body of Christ and at the same time own that he is a member of a denomination. But if he simply owns what the Lord by the Spirit has made him as a member of the one body, he owns all the true, and none other than the true, members of Christ's body. He thereby ceases to be a member of any sect or denomination, and owns every true believer in all denominations, though they in their positions are not owning him. This is the inward thing formed by the baptism of the Holy Ghost. The outward thing, which answers to it, is the one baptism of water in relation to the House of God. With the inward thing, the ground of the one body takes us out of the confusion and divisions of Christendom. So with the outward thing; the acknowledgment of one baptism gives us a similar catholic position in regard to the profession of Christianity. Instead of only owning such as are baptized as believers, or taking the ground of a Baptist Church, we would (as may be seen from the following paper) then own outwardly, "one Lord, one faith, one baptism;" and inwardly, "one body, one

Spirit, one hope." The inconsistency, indeed the impossibility, of owning the one body, and then dividing into sects about baptism will thus become apparent. What the owning of the one body is in relation to the inward possession of life and the Holy Ghost, the owning of the one baptism is in regard to the outward profession of the faith of Christ.

“ONE LORD, ONE FAITH, ONE BAPTISM.”

We have seen in an earlier paper how outward relationships obtain in Christianity. The basis of everything is the one Lord, or the Lordship of Christ as connected with the outward profession. As the risen Man Christ is Lord, and has “all power on earth,” and “power over all flesh.” This must be an outward claim when creation, infernal beings, unsaved and saved men are embraced. God has ordained that “at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of heavenly and earthly, and infernal beings, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord.”—Phil. ii. 10, 11. The field was bought in which the treasure was hid.—Matt. xiii. 44. Some will deny the Lord that bought them.—2 Pet. ii. 1. The Lord will deny that He ever knew some who call Him Lord.—Matt. vii. 21-23. This, however, will be “at that day,” “and then,” “when the Master of the house is risen up, and hath shut to the door.”—Luke xiii. 25. Outwardly, when the Kingdom was here in mystery, they were known and bought, though inward vital union is denied when it comes to the Kingdom in manifestation. Professors of Christianity, as in the case of the foolish virgins, will have the door shut against them, though they say, “Lord, Lord, open unto us.”—Matt. x. 11. So, as we have seen, husbandmen, servants, subjects, builders, churches will be owned and judged according to their professed relationships. There is, therefore, applied in an outward way, “one Lord,” who is owned, and who owns others, on the ground of profession.

His claims as Lord are owned in the “one baptism,” and so those baptised are brought into “one faith.” This is not that faith which is inwardly wrought in the soul, by which we are saved, but that which is outwardly “the words of faith and good doctrine.”—1 Tim. iv. 6. It is the faith of God, in which the servants were to be sound, or to be established, for which they were to contend, from which some erred, and others “denied the faith.”—Rom. iii. 3; Titus i. 13; Col. ii. 7;

Jude 3; 1 Tim. vi. 10. The "one faith" thus meant the outward profession of Christianity in contrast with Judaism. Hence the complete statement, "One Lord, one faith, one baptism," is all that which is *outward*, just as "one body, and one spirit, and one hope" give us that which is *inward*, in Christianity. In the first we have profession; in the second possession. With the one, as we have seen, is connected the baptism of water in its relation to the entire House of God; with the other is associated the baptism of the Holy Ghost and the one body of Christ. So, instead of the one baptism merely including the few who have been immersed as true believers, all who have had the name of the Trinity, or that of the Lord Jesus sacramentally used in water-baptism, in connection with the profession of Christianity, have been introduced into the sphere of privilege by the "one baptism."

It is necessary to look at this thought somewhat carefully in detail, keeping before us the question as to the warrant for baptism, by the aid of illustrations. Say here is a bank cheque for ten thousand pounds, signed by Rothschild, and payable to Smith, or bearer. What is the cause or warrant for cashing the cheque? We must keep three persons and one action distinctly before the mind. We have the banker, Rothschild, Smith (or bearer), and the cashing of the cheque. Say Smith, or somebody else, formally presents the cheque to the proper banker, why is it cashed? What is the cause or warrant for paying the money? It is clear that the signature of Rothschild is that warrant. The banker does not refuse to cash the cheque because Smith, or the person presenting it, has not ten thousand pounds. There might simply be a number instead of a name in the middle of the cheque, and it would be cashed all the same. Everything is made to turn upon the signature of Rothschild, and once that name is used and the cheque cashed there cannot be any legal or orderly repetition of the action. Corresponding to this in the subject before us we have the baptiser, the name of the Trinity, or the Lord Jesus, the subject of baptism, and the action of being baptised. What, then, is the cause or warrant for baptism? Must the baptiser insist that the subject of baptism be a true believer, and make that the warrant for baptising him? This would be equivalent to the banker requiring that Smith "or bearer" should possess ten thousand pounds. If the bearer did possess that amount,

that would not be a warrant for cashing Rothschild's cheque. What the bearer of the cheque has, or has not, does not affect the banker's action if the cheque is presented in a formal manner. It is the banker's business to see to that, and cash formal cheques on the warrant of the signatures of those for whom he acts. So the baptiser's action does not proceed as to its warrant on what is in, or possessed by, the subject of baptism. True, the cheque must be formally presented. The subject of baptism must also present himself as wishing to own the claim, and come under the authority of Christ as Lord. Then what is in the Lord Jesus will be seen to form the ground or warrant for baptism. The baptiser acts for, and on the authority of, the Lord, as given in the commission for baptising—Matt. xxvii. 19-20. The name of the Trinity or the name of the Lord is, therefore, quite a different thought as to the ground or warrant for baptism than that implied in "believer's baptism," or the condition, "if thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest be baptised." As we have seen, this is equal to the banker requiring that the bearer of the cheque should possess the money, and become the warrant for its being cashed. Men do not, nor could they long, carry on business in that style. But the thought of "believer's baptism" proceeds mainly on this supposition. It is well if the bearer presenting the cheque has money, or if the person presenting himself for baptism be a true believer. This, however, is not the point at issue. A penniless man, or a person bankrupt in all points of morals, would necessitate that banker and baptiser should see that all is right, and require them to be clear as to their warrant for action, or for refusing to act. It is true that in most cases in Scripture living faith and being baptised are found together, though, not to mention households, Simon the Sorcerer is an exception. There are two other things always present, though through habit of thought they have been often overlooked. These are, the name of the Lord Jesus, and that the person being baptised professes to come under the authority of that name, or, like the Philippian jailer, or Noah, he may also bring his house into the place of blessing. But, where believing or professing and the name of the Lord go together, which is the warrant for baptism? As the banker has only the signature of the cheque to act upon, the baptiser has only one Scriptural warrant. It is found in the name and authority of the Lord as given in the commission for baptism. A person must put

himself under the name and signature of the cheque he presents, in order to its being cashed. A person must put himself under the name of the Lord in order to be baptised. But in either case there is profession of the name, and the warrant for action is in that name, outside the person making the profession.

This would be as clear as the sun at noonday, and not require such amplification, were it not for the tenacious habit of thought which wants to connect the warrant for baptism with the *subject* of it, whereas Scripture connects it with the *object* of it, with the Lord Jesus. But the core of the whole controversy lies here. Recalling what was before us in an earlier paper, we saw that the outward position and the inward condition of the people of God were two distinct things from creation to eternity. With which of these is baptism connected? Is it outward, or inward? Is it position, or condition? Is it joined to profession, or possession? Does it set forth privilege for the future, or *only* death for the past? Is it a sign of objective, or subjective, blessing?—a sign of what is in Christ, or what is in the subject of baptism? Is it passing to a new outward place, or a witness to having previously received a new inward state? Does it imply that the subject of baptism died in Adam, and is buried *unto* Christ's death, or that he has actually died to sin *with* Christ, and shows forth his new condition by being baptised? Is it the owning of *God's act* at the Red Sea, or the confession of the *people's experience* in passing over Jordan? We hear nothing of the latter, but Scripture does connect baptism with the former. "All passed through the sea, and were all baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."

Baptism imports *burial*. Then why and when did the subject of it die? Which man is buried? The old man or the new man? Which is to be before the mind of the baptiser in the act of baptism? If he thinks of the believer, and acts mainly on the ground of setting forth his new inward state by burial, is it not like burying the wrong man? The believer is a new creation, and can never die, and does not require burial. The old man was dead in Adam and judged with Christ before the new man was born. If baptism is to be set forth, by *burial*, what is in the *subject* of it, instead of true believers only being proper subjects, every body may be baptised, for "If one died for all then were all dead."—2 Cor. v. 14.; Rom. v. 12-17. But if baptism shows forth what is in Christ, the

object of it, as to judgment and blessing, death and life, then those professing His name, and those owning His Lordship, can be "buried with Him by baptism unto death." Thus the ground or warrant for their baptism is not found in themselves so much as it is found in Christ, *unto* Whose death they are baptised. He has died out of the world, and taken a new place on resurrection ground. Christ desires His followers to be in His company in this new sphere, and, as Lord, having all power on earth, He said to His disciples, "Go and disciple all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The name of the Trinity, or the name of the Lord, with His authority, thus supply the warrant for baptism. Just as in the illustration, the name of Rothschild, not that of Smith or bearer, is the warrant for cashing the cheque. Our illustration may be thought to break down by supposing this or that as to the cheque. This, however, would only be a manifest begging of the question. Grant that such a thing is wrong in the illustration, and of course it is wrong in the thing illustrated, but it is simply asking that it be admitted to be wrong, instead of proving it to be wrong by a sound argument. But fairly treated the real ground or warrant for action, in either case, must be admitted to be *outside* the person to whom the action is performed. This is our point in contrast with believers' baptism, which makes it *inside* the person. Thus baptism implies *objective*, rather than *subjective*, blessing.

As the point is important, another illustration might clear it to certain minds. Tickets for travelling by tram-cars are sold in quantities to anybody, and may be used by anybody. What is the ground or warrant for travelling? Is it because of what the persons are in themselves, or because they are known to the guard, or on account of their presenting tickets? Clearly the guard, as acting for the Government, or company, can only own tickets as the warrant for travelling. That warrant is outside the travellers in the tickets they present. A traveller may not have a ticket, and get one from his neighbour, and the guard must own it all the same. The point before us is simply the warrant for travelling. So we want to grasp clearly and sharply the ground or warrant for baptising. The Government or company authorises the guard to allow persons to travel under the authority of the tickets issued. The Lord has authorised disciples to baptise those who put themselves under His name and authority. The

name and authority are outside the subjects of baptism, and, like the tickets for travelling, are the ground or warrant for their being baptised. The guard is responsible for seeing that there is a proper ticket. He can and must judge as to what is thus outwardly presented. It is not his province to determine the origin of the means or discern the motives for travelling. Likewise the baptiser can and must judge of what is outwardly professed by the subjects of baptism. He is not called on, nor should he take upon himself, to declare the state of their hearts. Like the disciples he will say, "Thou Lord, knowest the hearts."—Acts i. 24. Thus, what is *objective*, rather than what is *subjective*; what is *professed* outwardly, rather than what is *possessed* inwardly, is the warrant for baptism.

One is often surprised that those who know well how to put the Gospel before a sinner should fall into the sinner's mistake when it is a question as to the warrant for baptism. Everyone who has dealt with anxious souls has found that it is always with them a question as to what they must do, or how they can get to feel. They are seeking the ground or warrant for forgiveness within themselves, while it is wholly outside themselves in the word and work of the Lord Jesus. They must look away from themselves to Him. Since this is so as to an inward, vital change of heart, how should it be otherwise in regard to an outward change of position, in putting on the profession of Christianity by baptism? The word of the Lord, outside the sinner, is the only proper warrant for faith. The name and authority of the Lord, outside the subject of baptism, supply the real Scriptural warrant for a person being baptised. If, in the case of a sinner, penitence or anything in himself is made a condition of forgiveness, it is making light of the Word of God, and to that extent denying the all-sufficiency of the work of Christ. It is most desirable that there should be exercise, sincerity, and penitence with the sinner, but scarcely anyone outside Romanism would insist that his forgiveness depends on these, or what is in himself, but wholly on what is in another, the Lord Jesus Christ. How common, however, are these very mistakes in regard to baptism. It is remarkable that many should have got so clear of the Romanist view of justification, and yet cling to the shreds of the Romanist view of baptism. There is this difference: Rome connects baptism with the *imparting*, believer's baptism, with the *possession*, of the Holy Ghost and a right inward state of soul. Widely as they differ, they

agree in making baptism a link with what is *subjective*. Scripture makes the ground or warrant of baptism as *objective*, as the warrant for salvation. This, it will be admitted, wholly depends on the work, the word, and the person of Christ, not on the exercise, sincerity, or penitence of the sinner. When the things which characterise the sinner as the subject are put alongside those which characterise the Saviour as the object, there is little difficulty in seeing on whom salvation depends. Why should it be otherwise in regard to baptism? Subjects there must be, but salvation and baptism are properly only of the Lord. The warrant for travelling we saw was the ticket, not that the person presenting it was known. The ground for the cashing of the cheque was the signature, not the person requesting payment. So that which gives the warrant for baptism is the name of the Trinity, or the name of the Lord Jesus, not what is in the subject of baptism.

Hence we have no difficulty in seeing that there is "one baptism." Once use the name for a certain cheque, or have a certain ticket nipped, and you cannot legally repeat the action. Formally and legally done, it is done once for all. Though another person found the cheque or the ticket, and cashed the one, or travelled with the other, the action of the banker or the guard could not be legally set aside. The cheque was cashed: a person travelled. So, if we grasp sharply the real warrant for baptism, it will be seen that *re-baptising* a person has no scriptural authority. If the mode, the subject, or the baptiser, be other than might be desired, the sacramental using of the name of the Trinity, or that of the Lord Jesus, by a disciple sincerely professing to act with His authority, so stamps the action that it cannot be undone or repeated. The person thereby has put on the profession of Christianity, or, strictly speaking, the baptiser has put the name of Christ upon him. "As many of you as have been baptised unto Christ, have put on Christ."—Gal. iii. 27. This is frequently quoted as proof that the subject of baptism, in the act, by personal faith, puts on Christ. This would make him baptise himself. It would be as if the hearer cashed the cheque by drawing money from his own account, instead of the warrant, the action, and the money proceeding from others. The warrant and the act of baptism are outside the subject of it; as much as the warrant and the act of justifying are outside the sinner. God justifies the ungodly, clothes with the garments of salvation, and covers

with the robe of righteousness.—Isa. lxi. 10. He makes the sinner the righteousness of God in Christ, just as He will cause him to “be clothed upon with the house which is from heaven.”—2 Cor. v. 2, 4, 21. Being predestinated, called, justified, and glorified are all of God, not the acts of the subjects of them.—Rom. viii. 30. Neither is being baptised the act of the subject of baptism. It is done in the name, and on the authority, of the Lord, by the person who baptises. Then no other disciple can have another commission to baptise the person again. In an *outward* way he has put on Christ, or as we have seen, Christ has been put on him. To make this “putting on” of Christ an *inward* thing would land us at once in the false doctrine which makes eternal life out of a few drops of water sprinkled on a child, or renders an adult a new creature by immersion in water.

But how if the “putting on” Christ is inward, would those who insist upon “believers’ baptism” proceed? The asserted ground of their action is that the person has already inwardly put on Christ. The Scripture in question implies that Christ is put on by baptism. They are, therefore, endeavouring to do what, on their own showing, has been done already. Such is the confusion and contradiction we arrive at by connecting the putting on of Christ in baptism with the *possession*, instead of the *profession* of Christ. But let it be the latter, then all is simple and consistent with there being “one baptism.” The Spirit says Simon the Sorcerer “was baptised,” and soon shows that he had not inwardly put on Christ. If he afterwards became a new creature and was baptised as a believer, it would have been *another* baptism. Scripture calls the first action baptism, and says there is only “one baptism.” The person is thereby received into the House of God, and one already inside the house cannot then be admitted at the door. But attach baptism to the sincere profession of carrying out the commission, stamping the action with the name of the Trinity or the Lord Jesus, and though mode, subjects, or baptiser be other than desirable, there can be only “one baptism” in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, unto the death of the Lord Jesus.

To deny that sprinkling is baptism goes further than the advocates of “believer’s baptism” contemplate. Weigh the thought somewhat carefully. It proceeds upon the assumption that the informal, or imperfect, celebration of an ordinance

renders it invalid. Where is the line to be drawn as to what is informal? As nothing here is perfect, is then baptism, or any other ordinance, impossible? Look at the thought in relation to the Lord's Supper. "We, being many, are one bread (one loaf), and one body; for we are all partakers of that one loaf."—1 Cor. x. 17. Here we have the Scriptural *mode* of partaking of the Lord's Supper by using *one loaf*. Where is the mode adhered to in the various denominations? If in any of them I have not seen nor heard of it. Then, on the ground of infant sprinkling not being baptism, because of failure in mode, the using of a piece of bread, or a loaf cut up, deprives the other ordinance of the character of the Lord's Supper. Will Baptists, who make so much of mode in baptism, thus deny that they themselves, and their fellow-Christians, partake of the Lord's Supper? The objection on the ground of failure in mode would apply with equal force to each ordinance. Further, the one loaf represents that all those partaking of it are real members of the body of Christ. According to the argument that the baptism of an infant is not baptism, because of the failure in the mode, or in the subject, the presence of an unbeliever would deprive the other ordinance of the character of the Lord's Supper. Where are the large gatherings at communions among the denominations without the mixture of unbelievers? Does any one believe that they can be found? Unless they can be found, however, according to the argument that an imperfect mode renders an ordinance invalid, even the real believers among the mixed communion gatherings do not receive the Lord's Supper. Only the most unbroken and uncharitable of Christians would deny that true believers in the various denominations do partake of what to them is the Lord's Supper. What is due to the Lord, and, according to Word, as to gathering to His name, separation from evil, and liberty for "the Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will," is altogether another question. The Supper is received nevertheless. This must be denied if, on the grounds mentioned, the sprinkling of an infant is denied to be baptism. Those who make so much of mode in the one ordinance, which is only once administered to the same person, would do well to see how, in the light of Scripture, they are carrying out the other, of which it is said, "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come." We plead for the charity and largeness of Scripture in speaking of both ordinances.

Baptism will not then be the badge of a sect, nor will it be assumed to be true only of believers immersed. The claims of the Lord, the catholicity of the faith, and of the House of God, will be recognised as expressed in the words, "One Lord, one faith, one baptism."

VARIOUS STATES YET ONE PLACE IN BAPTISM.

On hearing that some who have professed to leave all human systems would baptise children, many are ready with the remark, "It is just going back to systems." This shows, on the one hand, that the objectors do not understand what is held regarding baptism, nor, on the other hand, are they aware that there is not a denomination in which baptism is so taught and practised. The system must first be found, before there can be a return to it. If we begin with the Church of Rome, we find it teaches that the Holy Ghost is conferred in baptism. The Church of England follows very closely with baptismal regeneration; thus, "Baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, a child of God." The followers of Luther propagate similar views. Those who follow Calvin teach that saving grace is conferred by baptism, though it is not necessarily so tied to the ordinance as to be effectual at the time, or in any case at some future time, except in the elect, with whom, however, it might prove effectual even forty years after baptism was administered. This is the Presbyterian view, and in general, so far as there is definite teaching, the view of dissenting denominations which practise infant sprinkling. They connect baptism with the production, or the desire to have produced, some inward change in the heart of the subject baptised. The advocates of "believer's baptism," of all grades, on the other hand, connect the ordinance with a real inward change believed to be already wrought in the subject, and make his baptism a witness to, or confession of, that change of heart. The members of the Society of Friends profess to having received the real blessing in the "inner light," and dispense with baptism altogether. In which of all these phases of teaching is to be found what is expressed in this pamphlet? Not one of them touches the leading thought of what is here taught. The denominations, one and all, agree in connecting baptism in one way or another with an *inward state* to be produced or already

supposed to exist. The main thought of what is here advocated is that baptism is connected with an *outward place*. Instead, therefore, of going back to systems, we are either bringing out a new system, or getting back to the beginning, to the Word of God and the practice of the apostles. The teaching is shut off from all existing systems. It must, therefore, now come to this: are we bringing out another system as far as baptism is concerned, or getting back to the Word of God and recovered truth concerning baptism? Scripture, and that alone, must be the test of where the truth is on the subject.

In examining the verse, "If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest," we have failed to find another verse in which exactly the same thought is expressed. The presence of the verse in the authorised version, and in manuscripts dating about the sixth or eighth centuries, show that baptism was then connected with an inward state of heart. We also see that all denominations, from Rome downwards, have taught the same thing. The question then is, what do we find in Scripture at the beginning? To answer this we must further examine the Acts of the Apostles. But let the point at issue be clearly before the mind. All denominations agree in connecting baptism with an inward state. Is it so brought before us in the cases of baptism recorded in Acts? What is the proper state for a person to be in to be a proper subject for baptism? Or, does Scripture make little of *inward state*, and almost everything of *outward place*, in baptism? With which of these views do the cases in Acts coincide? It will be needful to examine some of them in detail. We begin with the choice of a successor to Judas. "Of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, until that same day He was taken up from us, must one be a witness with us of His resurrection."—Acts i. 21-24. This gives us a glimpse of the baptism of John as the starting point of the path of the disciples from among whom the choice is to be made. Nothing is said of their having been, or requiring to be, baptised with Christian baptism. There is no evidence that all or any of those here assembled had ever submitted to the ordinance instituted by the Lord after His resurrection. From what we have seen this is capable of a satisfactory explanation. Baptism is the putting on of the profession of discipleship. Here

they had been disciples and are said to have *companied* with those who were with the Lord Jesus all the time until the day He was taken up. All of them were openly known in the sight of men as keeping company with Christ. Peter, at the time of denying the Lord, was asked, "Art not thou also one of this man's disciples?" "Did not I see thee in the garden with Him?" Those who before and after His resurrection had been so known in the company of the Lord did not need to show forth by baptism that they took their places with Him, that they might also follow in His path. This they had done, and were continuing to do. There was no need, therefore, to tell them to show forth this by baptism. The reality, instead of the sign of it, had been manifest to all. Baptism could add nothing, nor show forth anything, in the way of *outward place*, to those who were so known as keeping company with the Lord. But if baptism is a witness to an *inward state*, the disciples ought to have been baptised with Christian baptism. After the Lord rose from the dead He breathed on them and saith unto them, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost."—John xx. 22. They had life before: here He linked them with Himself in resurrection life. If baptism is connected with this inward state, the disciples would have been baptised, and is it probable if they were baptised, we should have been left in ignorance of a fact of such importance in regard to the proper state and subjects for baptism? But at the time they were filling up the vacancy left by the betrayer they do not take it upon themselves to pronounce upon the inward state of those chosen. They say, "Thou Lord, which knewest the hearts of all." They do, however, speak and act upon their having had the outward place of keeping company with the Lord. When, therefore, we think of baptism in connection with outward place all is plain; but if we connect it with inward state, there being no mention of the one hundred and twenty being baptised, is a serious difficulty. We have other minute details, and why nothing about baptism? The descent of the Holy Ghost upon them at Pentecost, apart from any reference to the baptism of water, strengthens the thought that baptism implies a new outward place, rather than a certain inward state. Except in association with the person of the Lord, there was hitherto no sphere into which disciples could be received. When the Lord had ascended, no one could then be put in His company on the earth, but He sent down the

Holy Ghost and constituted the disciples the House of God. This was the new outward place, the sphere identified with Him risen from the dead. Those already inside, therefore, proceeded to receive such as wished to be outwardly known as disciples into this new sphere and outward company with the Lord by the baptism of water.

We come next to look at the case of those baptised on the day of Pentecost. The importance of this instance is apparent. In Matthew we have the only commission to baptise in connection with the nations. Luke gives us the fact that what was to go out so widely was to begin at Jerusalem. Here, then, in Acts ii. we have the actual commencement. The mission to the nations, as far as the twelve were concerned, breaks down. Here, however, with the commission fresh in their minds and the newly-found energy of the Holy Ghost in their hearts, we have the first and best specimen of the work which, beginning at Jerusalem, was to go to "the uttermost parts of the earth." If, apart from the commission, specific instructions as to order, or the proper state of the subjects in baptism are to be found, they may be expected here. Some wish to make this a unique case, applying specially to Jews, or such as were linked with the circumstances, or the guilt, attending the crucifixion of the Lord. We see, however, that Paul was sent to the nations, and that he also insisted on "repentance and remission of sins" in "testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks," and though not baptising many himself, his epistles show that baptism was not neglected.—Acts xx. 21; xvii. 30; xvii. 6-8.

When they heard that God had made that same Jesus, whom they had crucified, both Lord and Christ, "they were pricked in their hearts," and said, "what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptised, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." "Then they that gladly received his word were baptised." What they received, as we saw in a previous paper, was a word about repentance and baptism. It came to them, already "pricked in their hearts," and promised that forgiveness of sins, and the gift of the Holy Ghost should *follow* repentance and baptism. This was a very different inward state from being believers, having forgiveness already, and being baptised as a witness to having actually received this blessing.

If it is urged that "the remission of sins" here spoken of is wholly administrative, as in Saul's case, why is "his word," which they received, should Peter urge them to "repent," and that repentance be linked with forgiveness of sins as a result that would follow? When with Saul it was simply a question of administrative forgiveness, Ananias said nothing about repentance, though he urged being baptised. Saul had repented, had been forgiven, and had also received the Holy Ghost. His was quite a different inward state from the state of those Peter urged to repent and be baptised in order to receive forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost. In Saul's case the double blessing was enjoyed before baptism. Those at Jerusalem are told to be baptised that the double blessing may be enjoyed. Which of these, then, is the proper state for baptism? To which inward state is baptism a witness? Which ought to be confessed by the subject in making baptism his own act? Scripture sanctions both baptisms, but not on the ground of inward state at all. If baptism is seen and owned as connected with outward place, as putting on the profession of discipleship, and being received into the house of God, all is simple and consistent. With the hundred and twenty there was no baptism, as they had been known and owned as having companied with the Lord. Those at Jerusalem and Saul were put in His company in being received into the place where the Holy Ghost had come to dwell, and where Christ was owned as Lord, as Saul's "calling on the name of the Lord" implies. We can see how the three thousand were baptised on the ground of *professing* to own Christ as Lord, and how the Lord sanctioned it by the blessings following; but how they should have been *examined* and *proved* and baptised as *believers*, all in seven or eight hours, is difficult to determine. With even a third of the hundred and twenty to help in the work, the actual baptising presents little difficulty; but to obtain proof that the subjects were believers, and baptise them as a witness to this inward state would have been a very different matter. Taking them on their profession of owning Christ as Lord, and receiving them into the place where His Lordship was owned, and where He confirmed the act by the blessings following, removes all difficulties. Acting, as repentance implies, on the after-thought given by Peter's words, they were baptised, and received actual and administrative forgiveness and the gift of the Holy Ghost.

At Samaria, through the preaching of Philip, many are said to have believed, and "Simon himself believed also." All were baptised, but as yet the Holy Ghost had not been received by any of them. The apostles came and "laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." Here, again, we find diverse inward states. Simon was proved a mere professor, and we are not told that he was the only one whose believing was of the same kind. With the real believers forgiveness, as connected with believing, came first, then they were baptised, and then they received the gift of the Holy Ghost. Baptism thus came between the blessings, not before both, as at Jerusalem, or after both, as in the case of Saul. With Simon, and any others who so believed, there was baptism without either of the blessings. It should be remembered, too, that the man in connection with whose preaching Simon was baptised was a man full of the Holy Ghost, as well as the man who showed he was a hypocrite.—Acts vi. 3. We see, therefore, that on the ground of profession of discipleship, or reception to outward place, rather than the possession of life, or a certain state, the baptisms at Samaria can be consistently explained.

At Cæsarea, among the Gentiles, "while Peter yet spake these words the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the Word," and then they were "baptised in the name of the Lord."—Acts x. 44-48. Here is another case like Saul's, where baptism came after forgiveness, and the reception of the Holy Ghost. But is it an instance of the subjects of baptism confessing, by the act, that they had experienced a new inward state? Are they urged to show forth anything of the kind by being baptised? The whole question, as we have previously seen, is made to depend on the willingness of *others*. The fact of the Gentiles having received the Holy Ghost is given as a reason for others being willing to baptise them. It is *not* used to urge the subjects of baptism to show forth their new inward state by being baptised. The question of willingness and the act of baptism are equally supposed to be outside the Gentiles, and to depend upon Peter and the brethren from Joppa. It was for the latter to own the Gentiles and receive them into the new place by the baptism of water.

"At Ephesus, certain disciples who had been baptised with the baptism of John, are again baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus," and receive the Holy Ghost.—Acts xix.

John's baptism is thus shown to have been superseded by Christian baptism, and the disciples at Ephesus, unlike the hundred and twenty at Jerusalem, are baptised again. This is no difficulty, if we bear in mind that the latter were openly known as having companied with the Lord, and had in reality all baptism could show forth in symbol; while the former could now only be outwardly put in His company, and received to the new place, by being "baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus." Everything is plain if baptism is connected with profession or place, instead of possession, or a certain ascertained inward state.

In the seven cases examined, which inward state can be said to be the proper state for the person to confess in his baptism? On which state, if it even could be certainly ascertained, is the baptiser to admister baptism? Would different evangelists form the same judgment regarding each candidate? Has the carrying out of the commission to baptise been left open to such perplexity? Certainly not. Disciples are to disciple the nations by baptising and teaching them to observe all things whatsoever the Lord has commanded. It is true that baptism has something to say to the past as well as the future, but when it is connected with profession of discipleship and outward place, as an introduction to the House of God, the various inward states which are owned in Scripture as having been baptised, appear perfectly consistent.

Instead of witnessing to an inward state *already attained*, baptism *reaches towards* an outward place in company with the risen Lord. In Rom. vi. we are said to have been baptised *unto* Christ Jesus, baptised *unto* His death, buried with Him by baptism *unto* death. The preposition "unto" best expresses the meaning of the original when, as here, it marks the motion towards, or entrance into a new place or sphere. Resurrection is, strictly speaking, not attributed to baptism, nor could baptism be the means of raising us together with, or in Christ. This depends on "faith of the operation of God," or God's raising us up as He raised Christ. But as it is "baptism *unto* death," neither is it so much that the person is dead already, as *reaching towards* Christ's death. A garment is dipped in the dye *unto* the desired colour, not as having the colour already. The act of dyeing is not performed because of an inward change of texture, nor is the dipping expected to alter for the better the fibre of the fabric. The process, how-

ever, does produce a new outward change of colour. This colour was the thing *unto* which the garment was acted upon. So "baptism unto death" does not proceed because of an already attained inward change of state, or for the production of such a state, in the subject. It is rather motion towards a new outward standing in the place where, through death, Christ is owned as Lord. Let this be seen and owned, then a child may be brought there as well as an adult; parents and their children may, through baptism unto death—like Noah and his house through the flood, or those who came from Egypt through the sea—pass to the place where the Lord's claims are owned in the House of God.

This is quite a different thing from being recognised as members of the body of Christ in breaking bread at the Lord's Table. Baptism has to do with individuals, or with families as linked with a parent, and is an outward recognition of the Lordship of Christ. The Lord's Table is for the members of the one body who, as such, there own their inward vital union with the Head, and all others who are united to Him by the one Spirit. When once a person has taken his place, thus openly owning Christ as the Head, and all the members of His body, he could not be more manifestly put in outward company with the Lord by baptism. Properly, he ought to have been baptised before coming there, but once he is there, to take him apart and baptise him is manifestly out of place. It makes the outward individual relationship owned in baptism of more importance than the inward corporate union with the Head and members of the body as expressed at the Lord's Table. The person was *discipled* in the breaking of bread more distinctly than he could have been, or ever be again, in the act of baptism.

When those gathered to the Lord, therefore, allow an outward individual ordinance to divide their sympathies, or divide them into parties, are they not thereby showing how very feebly they have apprehended what gathering to the Lord or baptism really imply? While endeavouring to keep the unity of the water, they are manifestly failing in "endeavouring to keep the unity of the spirit in the uniting bond of peace."—Eph. iv. 3-4. Surely the principle of the Lord's words might come with equally withering rebuke: "Ye pay tithes of mint and anise, and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith; these ought ye to have done and not to leave the other undone." How

much better to "forget these things which are behind and reach forth unto those which are before. Let us, therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded: and if in anything ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless, whereunto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing."—Phil. iii. 13-16.

THE BAPTISM OF HOUSEHOLDS.

When here in person, after being manifestly rejected by Israel, the Lord showed that He broke the link with the nation, and indeed with nature, by ceasing to look for fruit, and beginning a new thing, representing Himself as a sower going forth to sow.—Matt. xii., xiii. The result of that sowing, or the preaching of the Word, was the production of the outward sphere called "the kingdom of heaven," or literally, "the reign, or rule, of the heavens."—Dan. iv. 26. It will, in a future day, be set up in manifested power and glory; but meanwhile, it is to be in the mysterious form in which the good and the bad will be allowed to "grow together until the harvest." In Matt. xiii. we have a panorama of the kingdom from the time of the Lord's introducing it till His return to reign. The parable of the sower sets forth the results of His personal ministry; the next three parables represent the mixture, evil-increase, and corruption of the outward sphere; the last three bring before us the real inward thing on account of which the kingdom, though so corrupted, was owned in an outward way. In the same connection the Lord speaks of a "scribe instructed (literally *discipled*) unto the kingdom of heaven;" and, again, of little children He said, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven"—Matt. xix. 14—showing that the kingdom was wider than what was the real inner work of the Spirit, and that, apart from conversion, little children belonged to the kingdom. Those of whom he spoke were such as the Lord could take in His arms and bless. If they merely represented, or *resembled*, believers with a child-like spirit, He might as well have blessed sheep, or doves, or good seed, because these are also used to represent what is real in the kingdom. But He did bless the little children of those who were around Him, and claimed them as belonging to the kingdom. He also showed that this kingdom would be taken

from Israel and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.—Matt. xxi. 33-36. Thus we have the bringing in of those Gentiles and their little children to whom the kingdom comes through the preaching of the Word, by which this outward sphere is created.—Matt. xiii. 19. The coming and abiding presence of the Holy Ghost rendered this outward sphere still more distinct by constituting it the House of God. The presence of believers in whom the Spirit dwells, and the testimony He gives through them, create this sphere, but the Spirit is present outside believers, convincing the world and quickening those dead in sins; a witness to Christ's exaltation, His perfect work, and God remembering sins no more.—Acts v. 32; Heb. x. 15-17; John xvi. 8. The Spirit has, therefore, a wider sphere than real believers, or those whom He has formed into the body of Christ, the Church of God. Where the Spirit dwells and works in the world we have the kingdom, the House of God, or Christendom as it now exists. As seen in the buying of the field, in *title* by right of purchase, the world belongs to the Lord.—Matt. xiii. 44. His claim is owned, in an outward way, where His name is professed, but His manifest *possession* awaits a future day when His enemies will be made His footstool. Meanwhile, where the Word of the kingdom is preached, the Spirit, like an ambassador, represents the King, maintaining relations with the distant seat of power, till the whole territory will be purged and openly annexed when He comes whose right it is to reign.—Matt. xiii. 40-43.

It will now be conceded that there is an outward visible system in connection with Christianity. It is also clear, from Rom. xi. 15-22, that Gentiles now occupy a place of privilege and outward nearness to God, as the Jews did of old. The breaking off of Israel made room for the Gentiles being grafted in, and partaking of, the root and fatness of the olive-tree. Israel, as the branches sprang from Abraham, as the root. When God called Abraham and made him the depository of the new departure in His ways, He not only promised, "I will make of thee a great nation," but also, "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed."—Gen. xii. 1-3. Israel is the nation; "the families of the earth" are the Gentiles. Those now brought into the privileges in connection with Christianity are grafted into Abraham as the root. As with Israel, there was that which was outward, and that which was inward; so we find the same in Christianity; but they

are brought outwardly near "that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ."—Gal. iii. 14. It is worthy of notice, likewise, that God spoke to Abraham of "the families of the earth." It is true that "families" may refer to nations, as "the family of Egypt." This only harmonises with the commission to baptise nations; strengthening the idea that God thought of companies rather than of units in connection with Gentile blessing. From first to last we find Him always associating the children with the parents. It is divine order that they should be blessed in families. In this respect Abraham is not only the root, but he is also the pattern. It was said of Abraham, "All the nations shall be blessed in him, for I know him that he will command his children, and his household after him, that they shall keep the way of the Lord."—Gen. xviii. 18, 19. How becoming, therefore, in seeing that we are brought into blessing with Abraham that our faith and practice, like his, should proceed in the divine order of families and households. The Spirit of God, in speaking of Abraham's faith, gives prominence to this thought of family blessing. "By faith he sojourned in the land of promise; as in a strange country; dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise."—Heb. xi. 9. The Lord puts the same thought in connection with Zacchæus—"This day is salvation come to this house, forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham."

After the Holy Ghost had been given at Jerusalem, and through the Apostles also at Samaria, the next step towards "the uttermost parts of the earth" (Acts. i. 8) was among those at Cæsarea, who were distinctly Gentiles. When Peter, as directed in the vision, had come to Cæsarea, he found that "Cornelius waited for him, and had called together his kinsmen and near friends."—Acts x. 24. It was on these, "while Peter yet spake, the Holy Ghost fell." Thus the first instance of the blessing of Abraham coming on the Gentiles was in connection with a family, and in perfect accord with the ancient charter, "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." It is important also to notice that the angel said to Cornelius, "Call for Simon, whose surname is Peter, who shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved."—Acts xi. 14. If men choose to make blessing exclusively individual now, and in practice and faith fail to bring even their children into the sphere of blessing in a Scriptural

way, it is well to get back to the source, and find that God has spoken and acted according to His own thought of family blessing. The simple-minded Christian who has been taught, and has conscientiously acted according to the thoughts connected with believers' baptism, will let them go, "that, as ye have heard from the beginning, ye should walk in it." To follow in the footsteps of Abraham, he will endeavour to command his children and his household after him, "that they should keep the way of the Lord." Instead of taking one place for himself as outwardly brought nigh to God, and allowing that his children are in another place at a distance, he will show in God's way that, as regards place and outward nearness, they stand together. Abraham and his children and household; Noah and his house; and the fathers and their wives and their little ones who came from Egypt; all show that, as regards outward nearness and privilege, there was one place of blessing for families, as families and households, and the commission was to baptise nations.

It is significant also to observe that after the Holy Ghost was owned to be working on Gentile ground, instances of household blessing and baptism are fully more prominent than the blessing of individuals. We have, after the household of Cornelius, the households of Lydia, the Jailer, Crispus, and and Stephanus.—Acts xvi., xviii., 1 Cor. i. 16. It is also very remarkable that the Apostle of the Gentiles, in answering the earnest inquiry of the jailer, said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved, and thy house."—Acts xvi. 31. If circumstances would justify giving a reply that was strictly individual, they were there. Yet, instead of thinking of him alone, as he was evidently so distressed that he could only think of himself, the Apostle acts according to God's thought of families, and replies, "thou shalt be saved, and thy house." "He was baptised, he and all his, straight-way." "He rejoiced with all his house, having believed in God." It is remarkable that "rejoiced" and "believed" in the original are put in the singular, agreeing with the one man who is said to have "rejoiced and believed." Those in his house heard the word, and may, also have believed, and there was rejoicing householdly; but it is only said that he believed, yet all were baptised.

In the same chapter we have the case of Lydia, "whose heart the Lord opened." Nothing is said as to others believing, yet, "she was baptised, and her household." The house-

hold may or may not have embraced children; but if those in it were her servants, she was only acting like Abraham in commanding his household after him. That the baptism, and not the believing, of the household is mentioned; is the more remarkable when this case and that of the Jailer are compared with the household of Crispus, of whom it is said, "He believed on the Lord with all his house." The believing of all the house is given as a special feature, as in the case of Cornelius, when "the Holy Ghost fell on them which heard the word." It rather betrays a desire to cling to the thoughts connected with what is called Believer's Baptism, that simply to be subject to Scripture when there is an effort made to make household mean something else than household, or objection taken because there is not the express mention of children. It would be singular indeed if of the four households mentioned it could be proved that they did not in one case include children. If I simply take the four households in which I stayed in a certain town, there were children in three of them. In any other four households to be mentioned or thought of in a similar way, it will be very exceptional to find that there are not children in any of them. So the households of Scripture must have been strange indeed if not one of them included children. It is urged that it is not said that there were any children. Neither does Scripture say that there were none. The silence is as strong the one way as the other. But a commission was given to baptise nations, and there are children in them. It is difficult to prove from the literal words of Scripture, apart from *inference*, that women partook of the Lord's Supper, yet who questions it? Women were in the assembly where there is "neither male nor female," but this is inference, and not literal proof, that they broke bread. All admit them to the Supper though the word "women" may not be found, yet many refuse baptism to children, because children are not mentioned. To be consistent they ought to refuse women the Lord's Supper.

Paul speaks of the house of Stephanus addicting themselves to the ministry of the saints.—1 Cor. xvi. 15. It has been urged that if there were children baptised in that household, there must also have been "baby-ministers." It does not follow. In one connection we often speak of a household, meaning every individual of whom it is composed; and in another connection speak of the household

when certain individuals in it are before our minds. The original bears out this thought. One word is used which commonly includes all in the household, when it is said they were baptised. Another word is used which commonly includes only a certain class in the household when Paul speaks of their ministering. The first word when applied to persons means the children of the House. The second word is never so used in the New Testament, but usually means servants. Paul had baptised the household, and the servants ministered to the saints. So this argument for the purpose of showing there could not be any children in that household, is rather a far-fetched and feeble argument.

In Matt. xviii. the Lord Jesus speaks of the little child He had set in the midst of them: "Whoso shall receive one such little child in my name receiveth me." That He means literally a little child is seen from "this little child;" "one of these little ones;" "that which was lost;" as distinguished from a person with a child-like spirit; or, "one of these little ones which believe in me." How can a parent now receive a little child in the name of the Lord? The child has been received by him on the ground of nature, in the sphere of sin, where death and judgment linger. Out of this sphere and scene Christ passed by dying unto sin once.—Rom. vi. 10. A debtor dying in prison thereby passes out of the sphere in which his debts are, and where the law has power to punish him. Death perfectly separates the deceased and his debts—the two spheres are absolutely distinct. The child born in sin is in the one; the Lord Jesus who has died unto sin once is in the other sphere. Death, like the Flood or the Red Sea, rolls between them. In the sphere beyond death, on resurrection ground, Jesus is Lord. "A name which is above every name," has been given Him because He "became obedient unto death."—Phil. ii. 8-11. "Thou hast given Him power over all flesh," and "all power on earth."—John xvii. 2; Matt. xxviii. 18, 19. This power is His, and He is Lord peculiarly as one who is in resurrection. For the Christian parent who has himself been put in the resurrection place in company with the Lord, the only way of receiving his child in the name of the Lord must therefore be by owning death and judgment on the child. Of this, the Lord Jesus has appointed burial in water as the sign. "We are buried with him by baptism unto death."—Rom. vi. By baptism the Christian parent owns that on the ground of nature his child was lost: he thereby

shows by burial in water that death and judgment were due. Christ's name and claim as Lord having been owned in the waters of death, the parent receives his child in the Lord's name to the place of outward nearness in company with Christ in the new sphere. Here, and properly only here, can he bring up his child in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.—Eph. vi. 4. Having owned in baptism where the child was, and where the Lord was, they are now in company, and “the nurture and admonition of the Lord” begin. Much may be done without baptism, but it is like drilling men before they are enlisted. Own the authority of the Queen by receiving the shilling, and then drill and instruction are in order. So, after owning the Lord in baptism, the nurture and admonition of the Lord commence in a scriptural way. The child is then, scripturally, with the parent in the House of God, where the Holy Ghost dwells, and is working to quicken the dead and seal the living, that they become members of the body of Christ. It is true that unbaptised children are as often saved as children who have been baptised. But to argue from this that children may therefore just as well be left unbaptised proves too much, and proves the argument itself to be a fallacy. One frequently finds that persons at sea, or in the bush in the colonies, far from where the Word is preached, or others while wilfully neglecting the preaching, have been converted in a remarkable manner, while those within reach, or actually hearing the Word, have been left unsaved. Would any one argue from this fact that it is therefore just as well that unsaved persons should not go to hear the Gospel? They would be as consistent in so doing as Christian parents are in refusing to baptise their children because the Lord in His mercy often saves children before they are baptised. It pleases God through the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe, and, therefore, there is a responsibility to hear the Gospel. The Lord has given a commission to disciple the nations by means of baptising and teaching, and Christian parents are responsible to act accordingly. The kingdom has come to them, and their children belong to it—they are in the House of God, and through baptism they can bring their children, Scripturally, into the same place, counting upon the Lord making good His Word, “Thou shalt be saved and thy house.”

Some refuse to baptise their children because they would thereby bring some into the House of God who are not real

believers. It is true that baptism is the scriptural way of bringing into the House of God; but can it be said that children who are not baptised, though trained by Christian parents, are not actually in the House? Certainly not; they are in it, and enjoying its privileges; but they are there informally, and the enjoyment of the privileges is an irregularity. Instead of the parent, by refusing to baptise them, thereby preventing confusion, he is working in confusion by taking what belongs to the House of God and giving it to those who have not been brought there according to Scripture. In sovereignty the Lord can work anywhere, but we see when He creates a special sphere, either in Judaism or Christianity, *His way* is to act in the sphere according to the constituted relationship. As given in the commission, His way of blessing the nations is by discipling through means of baptising and teaching.

The Lord Jesus said to the woman of Samaria, "Salvation is of the Jews." The Jews were then in the enjoyment of privileges. If a Gentile came into blessing it was through becoming identified with Israel. The sphere in which God was then working was that of His chosen people, and when Samaria was blessed it was through the Jews in the person of the Lord, or His apostles, and in connection with Jerusalem. The "Woman of Canaan" craved a blessing of the Lord under the title of Son of David.—Matt. xv. 22. He said, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." After being compared to a dog she said: "Truth, Lord; yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their master's table." Jesus answered her: "O, woman, great is thy faith; be it unto thee even as thou wilt." Thus, when she gave up any claim on Him as Son of David, and appealed to Him as Lord, her request was granted. The Lord thereby showed that though free to bless, it was not His way to bless by taking the blessings belonging to one sphere and dispensing them in another. He did not bless this Gentile as if she were a Jewess, but showed that the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon Him. In Acts xv. 11-14 we find the sphere of blessing had been reversed, and that salvation was then, and is now, of the Gentiles.—Acts xiii. 46, 47. Instead of Jews being in privilege, Jews say of Gentiles, "Through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they." Though Gentiles have been visited with blessings, it cannot be said that all Gentiles are inside the sphere of privilege. The Holy Ghost can only be said to dwell where

Christians live. The Lord, by the Spirit, can and does work apart from Christendom now as He did apart from Judaism of old. Now, as then, however, the normal sphere of his operations is among or around the people of the Lord. As we have seen, the presence of believers, the indwelling of the Spirit, and the preaching of the Word, constitute that sphere, and baptism is the recognition of it. But apart from baptism, the use of a Christian name is an acknowledgment of this sphere—a profession of Christianity. But by baptism the profession is put on; the Lordship of Christ is owned; the person is scripturally introduced into the Lord's present sphere of privilege and blessing.

The following has been written as to the parable of the wheat and the tares in the kingdom: "If evangelists knowingly baptise unconverted persons, children or adults, and introduce them into the kingdom, *would they not be doing Satan's work?* In John iii. we get God's way of entrance into the kingdom: 'Except a man be born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God. Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.' This, then, is God's way of entering the kingdom; how, then, can you bring in unconverted persons, children or others? We have seen there is another way, but it is Satan's work." Is this not confusing, or confounding, things that differ, and thereby casting dust in people's eyes? Observe that it is assumed that kingdom in Matthew xiii. means the same thing as kingdom in John iii. By this ambiguous term, used for the mixed sphere temporarily set up in the world, in the one case, and for the real children of God in eternal relationship with Himself, in the other, the conclusion is reached that God's way of causing a man to enter the kingdom is by the new birth, and Satan's way is by the baptism of unbelievers. To follow out this conclusion, it implies that unbelievers *have entered* the Kingdom of God, as spoken of in John iii., otherwise than by the new birth, and therefore John iii. is not true in saying that, Except a man be born again he cannot see, much less enter the Kingdom of God. Thus may the false reasoning of men's minds contradict the word of God. But it will be admitted that we have no sympathy with the Romanist or the Ritualist notion, that by baptism, unbelievers, children or adults, can be brought into the Kingdom of God, as given in John iii. This would make baptism import an inward change of condition, instead of an outward change of position.

It has been urged, "Persons are born into Chris-

tendom, and need not baptism to introduce them, and if they do need it, we have failed to discover any authority in Scripture for such a use of baptism." It is not questioned that such as are born in what is called Christendom are in it, partaking of the privileges of an open Bible and a preached Gospel. They are indeed in the sphere where the Holy Ghost dwells, and is working to quicken the dead in trespasses and sins. They have privileges and responsibilities, and will be judged accordingly—Rom. ii. 4-9. But the question is, Are those born in Christendom, and thus, more or less, enjoying its privileges, in the sphere of these privileges in a scriptural way? Does Scripture show any other way of coming into the privileges than by birth? If so, is a Christian parent acting rightly towards his children while neglecting to own the claims of the Lord? He may say—"I, for one, have more faith in the efficacy of commending our children to the Lord in prayer, than by baptising them, because efficacy is attributed to the prayer of faith, while I find it isn't so stated of baptism." This confuses the outward and inward things, supposing that baptism may be used by some as the means of producing inward spiritual life, and professing that prayer does give outward nearness to the Lord. This is just the converse of what is taught in Scripture. The inward blessing may be given in answer to prayer, but even then the outward place would be connected with, and only Scripturally conferred, by baptism. The children born of the flesh are flesh—John iii. Then, in commending them to the Lord in prayer it is offering flesh to the Lord. It is Cain's offering which fails to own that distance and death have come between them and the Lord. The children are, strictly speaking, in the sphere of nature where they were born in sin. The Lord is in resurrection after having died unto sin. The Lord has not said that prayer can bridge this gulf, and put children outwardly in His company in the new place where His Lordship is owned. But he has appointed baptism as the acknowledgment of there being only death and judgment for the flesh, and all in the sphere of nature out of which He Himself passed by death. The disciples were to disciple the nations, baptising them—Matt. xxviii. "As many as have been baptised unto Christ Jesus, have been baptised unto His death"—Rom. vi. 3. Christ died, and man, Satan, and the world were judged in His death on the Cross—John xii. 31; xvi. 11. It is a very shallow view of the case to think that a

man dies when he is converted or born again, and that he shows this in being baptised as a believer. Death, in this sense, is no more true of the believer than of the unbeliever. "Even as by one man sin entered into the world, and by sin death; and thus death passed upon all men"—Rom. v. 12. All died in Adam, and all were judged in Christ's death, which set forth the ruin and end of the first man. Baptism has been appointed as the sign and acknowledgment of death by burial in water. To ignore this and commend children to the Lord by prayer is going "in the way of Cain." The act makes light, on the one hand, of where the children are by nature in the sphere of sin and death; and, on the other, of where the Lord is in resurrection as having "died unto sin once." But by baptism the Christian parent accepts death for his child, by burial in water; like Abraham, "accounting God able to raise up, even from the dead"—Heb. xi. 19. What is more, by the act the child passes to the new place where, with the parent, it is outwardly in company with the Lord. The Lordship of Christ has been owned as having all power on earth, "power over all flesh"—Matthew xxviii. 18; John xvii. 3. Though in Christendom before, the child is now in it scripturally, bearing the stamp of death. See this in the case of Noah and his family. Noah alone was spoken of as *righteous*, or having *faith*, yet seven others went with him to the new place—Heb. xi. 7; 1 Pet. iii. 20-21. "Eight souls were saved through water, which figure also now saves you, even baptism." The salvation was not that of the soul and for eternity, but that of the body and on the earth. Their position set forth that they had been where death reigned, and they were now where life might be enjoyed. By living up to the privileges of the new place all would be well for time and eternity. So, when the baptised, through the quickening power of the Holy Spirit, have the inward blessing answering to the outward privileges, there will be a good conscience towards God through the resurrection of Jesus Christ. It is not baptism, but the blood and resurrection of Christ which give a good conscience towards God. The happy feelings of a person on being baptised may be connected with, but they would be a poor substitute for, what alone can give a good conscience towards God.

Again, in the history of Israel the Red Sea was passed through as the sign of death. They "were all baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea"—1 Cor. x. 2.

Their passage through the Red Sea told of death and judgment in the scene where they had been, and also of the life and blessing in the place to which they were being borne. "Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings and brought you unto Myself." They were outwardly in company with God, where they enjoyed privileges unknown to any other people on the earth. "But with many of them God was not well pleased, for they were overthrown in the wilderness." Now these things were types for us —1 Cor. x. 5-6. In being baptised in the cloud and in the sea it was not a question of one uniform, right, inward state of soul, as Believers' baptism implies, but one uniform outward place of nearness of body, out of Egypt into the wilderness to God. The Spirit, therefore, puts it beyond question, by using this as an illustration of baptism, that baptism is the Lord's own appointed way for bringing anyone into the outward place of nearness, or the profession of Christianity. To set aside baptism and substitute prayer in order to introduce children into the sphere of privileges, or bring them outwardly near to the Lord, is to act otherwise than "it is written" in the *commission* for discipling the nations by baptising and teaching.

With Abel, Noah, Abraham, and Moses, with Israel of old, and in Christianity now, the outward place of nearness to the Lord has been uniformly connected with the symbol of death. The resistance of Zipporah, the neglect of Moses, and the solemn dealing of the Lord in consequence, are among the things which "happened as types for us," and ought to have their force and weight on the consciences of parents who refuse to own the claims of the Lord in having their children baptised unto His death. Moses was sent to deliver Israel, and say unto Pharaoh, "Behold, I will slay thy son, even thy first-born." The next words recorded have thus a peculiar significance. "And it came to pass, by the way in the inn, that the Lord met him, and sought to kill him. Then Zipporah took a sharp stone, and cut off the foreskin of her son, and cast it at his feet, and said, 'Surely a bloody husband art thou to me.' So he let him go. Then she said, 'A bloody husband thou art, because of the circumcision.'"—Ex. iii. 24-26.

The Lord would have the parents and the children in the same place as to outward relationship, and having, through the symbol of death, received them to that place in the name of the Lord, the parents, in faith and prayer, ought to count upon the Lord quickening them, by the Spirit, to newness of life.

The Lord can and does save sinners apart from the efforts or the faith of others. But it was not without its special lesson that we are told of the four men who brought the man sick of the palsy and let him down through the roof in the presence of the Lord. The ground of the Lord's actions in forgiving and healing is thus indicated, "When Jesus saw their faith."—Mark ii. These men did what parents can and ought to do for their children in baptism. Through owning death upon them they can bring them outwardly near to the Lord, and exercise faith in Him to quicken those "dead in trespasses and sins." Will He who owned the service and faith of others on behalf of the paralytic fail to meet parents, thus suing Him upon His own bond for blessing to their children. He has said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved, and thy house."

Chorazin and Bethsaida, on account of special privileges in connection with the teaching and mighty works done by the Lord, will receive a more terrible judgment than Sodom, or Tyre, and Sidon. So those inside the sphere of God's special action now in Christendom, if found without life and the Spirit, at death, or the Coming of the Lord, will fare worse than those among the heathen. But the Lordship of Christ can be outwardly owned by being baptised unto His death, and faith will never fail to find the answering inward blessing, individually, or for one's house, in calling upon the name of the Lord. The faithful man, amid the confusion and perplexity of "a great house," in which he must of necessity now find himself, can still depart from iniquity by naming the name of the Lord. But if he makes a certain mode, or certain subjects, in baptism the test of fellowship, or membership, or the ground of association, or gathering, he is simply taking his stand on the outer thing, the profession, and dividing that into sects, instead of owning outwardly, the catholicity of the faith, in one baptism of water, and owning inwardly, the one baptism of the Spirit, by "endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the uniting bond of peace. To break this unity by pressing one judgment or another concerning baptism on those gathered to the name of the Lord, who are owning that there is one body, is not "following righteousness, faith, love, peace with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart."—2 Tim. ii. 22.