

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1864.

No. III.

ART. I.—*The Donatist Controversy.*

. 1. *The External History.*

DONATISM was by far the most important schism in the history of the ancient church, and involved important principles and measures concerning the true nature and discipline of the church, which reappear from time to time in active conflict, although under ever new forms and aspects; since history never repeats itself except in its general laws of Divine appointment and under providential control, and in its general tendencies of human nature and Christian life. For a whole century this schism divided the Christians of North Africa into two hostile camps. Like the earlier schisms in the preceding age of Cyprian, during the middle of the third century, it arose from the conflict of the more rigid and the more indulgent theories of discipline in reference to the restoration of the lapsed. But through the intervention of the nominally Christianized state since Constantine, it assumed at the same time an ecclesiastico-political character. The rigoristic penitential discipline had been represented in the previous period, especially by the Montanists and Novatians, who were still living;

ART. V.—*Christian Baptism spiritual not ritual.* By ROBERT MACNAIR, M. A. Eph. iv. 5, 1 Pet. iii. 21. Edinburgh: 1858. 16mo., pp. xi. 202.

THE design of Macnair's treatise is to establish the position, that the baptism spoken of in Christ's commission to the apostles,—“Go, disciple all nations, baptizing them;”—was not water baptism but that of the Holy Spirit,—that baptism with water is without divine warrant under the gospel dispensation, and that its administration is a pledge of ignorance and corruption in the Christian Church. The book, we understand to have acquired considerable reputation among the Society of Friends; and it has, within our knowledge, been the means of great perplexity in the minds of young inquirers on the subject. We propose, therefore, to present, with some particularity, the teachings of the Scriptures in contrast with those of the author.

Here, however, in the outset, we would guard against the mistake of any who may suppose the question at issue to involve, in any measure, a competition between water baptism and that of the Holy Spirit,—any sanction to the unscriptural pretence of baptismal regeneration,—or any, the least, disparagement of the baptism of the Spirit. Of the latter, it is impossible to describe the importance, in exaggerated terms. Without it, salvation is impossible. Possessed of it, salvation cannot fail. The question is not, therefore, whether water baptism is to be accepted as a substitute for the other, or, as inseparably identified with and imparting it, in any sense, or to any degree. All such ideas, whether veiled under the name of baptismal regeneration, or in whatever guise, we repudiate with horror; as derogatory to the high and incommunicable prerogatives of the Spirit of Christ.

But the question is, whether the Lord Jesus,—having promised the baptism of the Spirit to all his people,—has appointed the baptism of water to be an ordinance of perpetual obligation in the church, as a sign and symbol to the world, and seal to believers, of the blessings conferred by the spiritual baptism. That such is the clear and unequivocal testimony

of the Scriptures, will appear before we close. In fact, we shall see that Macnair himself distinctly recognizes that such was the doctrine of the apostles, as deduced both from their teachings and example. And he only succeeds in reaching the conclusions at which he aims, by taking the ground that they were in error on the subject.

The questions, therefore, at issue in the pages of this writer, involve the very foundations of our eternal hopes. To the apostles was the commission given by the Saviour, to organize the gospel church and establish its ordinances,—to preach the gospel and baptize all nations. To them the promise was given of the Comforter, to guide them into all truth, to bring all the instructions of the Master to their remembrance, and take the things of Christ, even all that the Father hath, and show them unto them, for their guidance in this office. Their names are written on the foundations of the New Jerusalem; and they, with the prophets of the Old Testament, resting on Christ the chief corner-stone, are its foundations. If they, then, could be mistaken, in a matter so plain yet so important as the meaning of the very commission by which they were sent forth to preach and baptize, we must be compelled to admit that the whole gospel of the Son of God, as proclaimed and recorded by them, may be a tissue of errors, and the great and precious promises, upon which we have been caused to hope, may all be delusive and vain.

In the present argument, we shall, in most cases, refer without reciting them, to the Scriptures relied upon; partly for the sake of brevity, and partly that they may be sought out by the reader, in the “more sure word,” and studied in the light of their connection there.

Macnair admits that the meaning of the word *baptism* must be realized more or less distinctly alike in the application of water and of the Spirit. *Macnair*, p. 11. He further states that it appears from such places as Isa. xliv. 3, 4, Ezek. xxxvi. 25—27, and Mal. iii. 1—3, that the essential idea is the bestowal of life-giving, refreshing, and cleansing influences. According to this view, then, the baptism of the Holy Ghost signifies his outpouring from on high, (Isa. xxxii. 15,) for the renewal and cleansing of the soul; and by the baptism of water

is meant the application of water to the person, so as to bring into view the other. This statement is true, so far as it has respect to the ordinary renewing gift of the Holy Spirit. But there is another baptism of the Spirit,—the baptism of power, which is to be broadly distinguished, although by Macnair, under the necessities of his position, insidiously confounded with the other.

We will first examine into the nature of these baptisms of the Spirit.

In all baptisms there are four things of essential importance. These are, the administrator; the matter of the baptism, or substance poured out; the subject of it; and the end or design of the administration.

1. In the baptism of the Holy Ghost, the substance poured out is the Spirit itself, the third person of the Godhead; who is personally imparted to dwell in the subject of it. Isa. xxxii. 15; Joel ii. 28—32; John xiv. 16, 17; Acts ii. 17.

2. The only administrator of this baptism is the Son of God. The power of shedding forth the Spirit of God from on high, can, manifestly, in the very nature of the case, be in none but God; and hence, in no man but Him who is also the Son of God. To argue, as does Macnair, that, as John was not the only one who baptized with water, therefore, others as well as Jesus may baptize with the Holy Ghost,—is to trifle with the subject. If it is possible for language to express a peculiar prerogative, John does it, with respect to Jesus's power of baptizing with the Spirit. "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: [which is no extraordinary display of power,] but he that cometh after me is mightier than I; whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire." Matthew iii. 11. (Compare this and the twelfth verse, with Mal. iii. 1—3.) Again, "I knew him not; but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God." John i. 33, 34. Thus John distinctly contrasts his own power, as a baptizer with water, with that mightier power which was displayed in the baptism of the Holy Ghost; and attributes the

latter to the omnipotence of Christ, recognizing it as a distinguishing attribute of the Son of God. As soon as, *ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*, "the Baptizer with the Holy Ghost," is pointed out to him, John at once recognizes him, although veiled in flesh, as the eternal Son of God. Not only so, but although the gracious influences of the Spirit did unquestionably accompany his own ministry, and the extraordinary baptism of the Spirit which Jesus received, took place under it—a baptism more abundant and remarkable than any other—yet does John deny to himself and attribute to Jesus the prerogative of baptizing with the Spirit. In so doing he equally denies it to the apostles, whose relation to the outpouring of the Spirit, in regenerating grace, upon the hearers of the gospel, was of precisely the same nature as was that of John.

Macnair asks, "Whether would his [Christ's] glory most conspicuously appear, in making an immediate gift of the Spirit to each follower; or, in causing that one disciple should be the channel through which his influence should flow to another;—in giving to each such a measure of his influences as would serve his own needs; or in imparting the Spirit so copiously as that they who had freely received, might freely give?"—*Macnair*, p. 65. Thus, if the doctrine of this writer be true, we are to expect the baptism of the Spirit—his renewing and sanctifying influences—not from the ascended Son of God, but from some fellow worm, who possesses a superfluity of the Spirit beyond "his own needs," with power to impart it to others at pleasure! Here have we the worst form of priestly usurpation and mediation between God and the sinner. That is the very spirit of antichrist itself, which would interpose a human medium between the one Mediator and the soul; or point lost men to any second-hand fountain of grace. And, to attribute to a mere man the power of pouring out the Spirit upon men, is little short of blasphemy. Where is the living man who will venture to arrogate to himself such a power? And how will he go about to exercise it? Yet is the command, "Go, baptize all nations."

3. There are two several baptisms of the Spirit spoken of in the Scriptures, which are discriminated from each other, alike,

as to the subjects of them, the effects produced, and the end had in view.

The baptism of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, is common to all the elect of God, and was enjoyed under the Old Dispensation as well as under the New. See Psalm li. 2, 7; Isa. vi. 6, 7. In fact, salvation is impossible to any man of any age without it. John iii. 5, 6. Its immediate effect is to unite the subject of it to the Lord Jesus Christ, and its design and end is the renewal and sanctification of those to whom it is given,—their imbueing with the Spirit of Christ, and formation after his image. It is given, ordinarily, in connection with the preaching of the word, without any visible sign, or outward manifestation, other than the transformation which marks the subsequent lives and characters of the renewed. See Tit. iii. 5; Rom. viii. 9; 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13; Gal. iii. 27, 28; John iii. 8.

The baptism of power was peculiar to the apostolic age, and bestowed upon none but the apostles and certain of the converts of their personal ministry. Its immediate effect was to confer upon the subjects of it the gifts of miracles and tongues. Its design and end was the miraculous attestation of the gospel proclaimed by the apostles. In the beginning of the gospel it was imparted to the apostles on the day of Pentecost, by the immediate agency of the Son of God, accompanied with visible tongues of flame, thus confirming the gospel which then began to be preached. Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4, 5, 8; ii. 1—4, 16—18, 43; Heb. ii. 4. In like manner it was imparted to the house of Cornelius, to attest the opening of the door of the gospel to the Gentiles. Acts x. 44—47; xi. 15—18. In other cases, it was conferred through the laying on of the apostles' hands; thus identifying it with that testimony of which they were the chosen witnesses. Acts viii. 14—18, 25; xix. 6.

We repeat, that the baptism of power is not, and was never designed to be, administered to all the people of Christ. This, the experience of the church testifies. Since the apostolic age it has entirely ceased, and at the present day there is no trace of it in the church, even where the most abundant evidence of the presence of the Spirit is given. Even in the times of the apostles, it was not given to all believers. All had the Spirit, in his renewing and sanctifying graces, but all were not

endowed with tongues nor power. See 1 Cor. xii. 4—11, 28—30. Nor was its general bestowment necessary to the ends for which this baptism was given. Heb. ii. 3, 4.

Another point, to be distinctly marked is, that whereas faith is a fruit of the Spirit—a consequence of the baptism of regeneration—(see Gal. v. 22; John i. 12, 13,) the baptism of power was given to believers, subsequent to their faith, and to the fruits of regeneration working in their lives. Compare John vi. 68—70; Matthew xvi. 16, 17, and Acts ii. 1—4; viii. 12, 14—17. xix. 2—6.

We have said, that the baptism of regeneration was common to all ages of the church, administered by the Son of God alone, and by him bestowed upon all his people. The question is here raised by Macnair—Wherein then consisted the peculiarity of the baptism which John announced, when he declared that Christ should baptize with the Holy Ghost? It consisted in several things. 1. The baptizer thus announced, did not exercise a new prerogative; but himself assumed a new form in its exercise. The Son of God was now clothed in flesh, and it was by the Son of Mary, the Son of Man that the baptism of the Spirit was thenceforth to be administered. Compare Luke iii. 15—17; John i. 29—34; xv. 26; xvi. 7; Acts ii. 33. 2. It was no longer to be limited to the nation of Israel, but to be bestowed upon all flesh. Acts ii. 17, 39; x. 44; xi. 15—18. 3. It is now given in more abundant measure than ever before. 2 Cor. iii. 7—18. 4. In testimony of this, and assertion of the exaltation, glory and power of the incarnate Son, it was to be introduced by the miraculous scenes of the day of Pentecost, and the baptism of power, promised by Christ before his ascension, and dispensed after it. 5. It was to be followed by a baptism of fire, an outpouring of wrath, consuming his enemies; a baptism fulfilled in the desolation of Jerusalem, and the ultimate destruction of all the rejectors of Christ. Mat. iii. 10—12. Compare Psalm lxxix. 6, xi. 6.

Macnair urges that the Spirit was imparted by the laying on of the apostles' hands, and hence concludes that it was their privilege to baptize with the Spirit, and that this was what was commanded them in their commission to baptize all nations. But in the first place, as we have seen, the laying on of the

apostles' hands was for conferring, not renewing and sanctifying grace,—but miraculous powers, to those who were already possessors of grace; it was not given to all believers; and, we may add, was not administered by any but the apostles alone. Acts viii. 18. It could not then be that baptism which is to be dispensed by the hands of Christ's servants, in all ages, even to the end of the world; and to be administered to all who receive the gospel. Second. On the day of Pentecost, the apostles and disciples themselves were the subjects of the baptism, and declared it to have been dispensed by Jesus. Acts ii. 32, 33. The baptism of Cornelius and his house with the Spirit, was in like manner independent of all human agency, and attributed to the same Divine power. Acts xi. 15—17. The gifts conferred upon the saints of Samaria were conferred, it is true, through the laying on of hands, but in answer to special prayer; in which, the apostles not only sought the gifts for the disciples, but recognized their own incompetence to confer them. When Simon the sorcerer thought this to be a "power" belonging to the apostles, and sought to purchase it, he is rebuked by Peter, for conceiving such an idea respecting "the gift of God." Acts viii. 14—20. And Paul declares these gifts of the Holy Ghost to have been God's own witness to the testimony of the apostles concerning the great salvation. Heb. ii. 3, 4.

We will now examine the testimony of the Scriptures as to water baptism. Of this two kinds are traceable in Macnair's own admissions; the first is the baptism of preparation, in the name of *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, "the coming One;" and was administered not only by John, but also by the apostles, under the direction of Jesus. John iii. 22, iv. 2, Matt. iv. 17, Mark i. 14, vi. 12. On *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, compare Matt. xi. 3, Acts xix. 4. In this baptism there was no specific mention of the Persons of the Godhead. The distinct manifestation of these was yet to take place through Jesus Christ. See John i. 9, 18, xvii. 6, 1 Tim. iii. 16. Hence some who were baptized of John did not know that there was a Holy Ghost—a fact which assured Paul that they had not received Christian baptism. Acts xix. 2—5.

The burden of this baptism was, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord." "Repent, for the kingdom is at hand." Its message

proclaimed "the coming One." Hence, its administration by the disciples, after Christ's ascension to heaven, would have been a denial that he was the Christ; as it would have taught the people to expect a Christ yet to come.

Besides this baptism, which he acknowledges to have been with water, it is admitted by Macnair, that there were unquestionable instances of water baptism, by the apostles and disciples, after the day of Pentecost. With respect to it, the evidence will appear in what follows. Its burden is that the King Messiah has come, and that Jesus is the Christ. Its administration is in the name of the blessed Three, of whom the Lord Jesus was the messenger, revealer, and mediator. Matt. xxviii. 19, Acts x. 48, xix. 2—5. Its testimony is, that the kingdom of heaven has come,—that Jesus now occupies the throne. Acts v. 31.

Let us now look at the history of facts, as bearing on the present inquiry;—and first, for the present purpose, we will accept Macnair's own answer to the question: How is it that until the ascension of Christ the word *baptism*, standing alone, designates that with water? *Answer*—The writers are speaking of baptism as an existing institution. The baptism heralded by John was yet future; and water baptism alone was then in being. "Till the time when the Spirit is given, they were safe in using the word *baptism*, even without an adjunct, as equivalent to water baptism." *Macnair*, pp. 19, 20. Such, then, is the fact, and the reason of it; our author being witness. Now, no rule is more imperative, nor manifestly reasonable and necessary, than that which forbids the historian or writer to depart from his own established usage, as to the application of words, without notice to the reader. We have found that, by admission, the Evangelists used the word, baptism, by itself, in all their narrations of the ministry of John, and the former part of the life of Jesus, to designate water baptism, whilst adjuncts or explanatory phrases are used with it, to indicate spiritual influences. Unless, therefore, we have notice of a change in this mode of expression, or find something in the context forbidding us, we are bound to regard the word as unchanged in its significance,—as meaning water baptism, —wherever we find it.

As bearing upon the present question, one of the most signal testimonies occurs in the early ministry of our Lord. John and Jesus, and their disciples, were employed in preaching that the kingdom of heaven was at hand; and administering the baptism of repentance, in preparation for its coming. Whilst engaged in these labours, Jesus was visited by a man of the Pharisees, Nicodemus, who indicates the object of his coming by his salutation, "Rabbi, we know that thou art a *teacher* come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him. Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see" (he cannot apprehend in its true spiritual nature) "the kingdom of God," which is at hand,—which I come to establish. "Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born? Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." John iii. 2—5.

Here, we accept the designation of Macnair as to "the kingdom of God." "It is hardly necessary to make the remark that the expression [Mat. xi. 11—15, Luke vii. 28—30,] cannot mean the kingdom of grace, for that would be to exclude the father of the faithful, and the man after God's own heart, from a participation in its citizenship. It must point to the gospel dispensation,—the form which the kingdom of grace assumed when the day of shadows passed away, and Jesus Christ assumed the government as king over His own house." *Macnair*, p. 23. In short it is the gospel church, imperfect and of mixed elements, here; but to be perfect, hereafter. Compare Matt. xxi. 43, xxiv. 30, xiii. 47—50, Luke ix. 27. Of this kingdom, Jesus declares, that no man can truly apprehend it, except he be born of the Spirit, (compare Luke xvii. 20, 21;) and that, in order to entrance into it, the birth of water must be superadded to the other. What was meant by this allusion to water, the employment of Jesus and his disciples, shortly after indicates, with abundant evidence. John iii. 22. That the spiritual baptism was the principal thing, the whole tenor of the discourse shows. That the water baptism is of imperative obligation as a symbol and seal of the other, Jesus testifies,

here; as, with equal emphasis, in the final commission given to the apostles.

When the preaching of the coming of the kingdom had been finished, and the King was about to assume the throne of grace, he gives the new and great commission to his disciples. You have heretofore proclaimed the kingdom at hand; but now it is set up. "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Matt. xxviii. 19. Here notice:

1. Jesus had already taught his disciples to baptize with water.

2. He had declared that the birth of water was necessary to entrance into the kingdom now to be set up, the visible gospel church.

3. He never hints that his apostles and disciples shall baptize with the Spirit. On the contrary, he and John had both taught them to recognize that as the prerogative, and demonstration of the power, of Jesus himself; and he promises that they, instead of baptizing, shall be baptized, with the Spirit.

4. Their powers were adequate to water baptism, but not to that of the Spirit.

5. No other than water baptism had yet been given, and the usage still held, which Macnair admits, of designating water baptism by the single word, *baptism*. They could not, therefore, have understood the words in any other sense than as enjoining them to baptize with water. How in fact they did understand them, we will presently see.

Here, however, it is necessary to notice the nature and significance of water baptism.

1. Its design is twofold;—to seal to the subjects of it the blessings of the covenant of grace; and, to testify to the witnessing world of the manner in which the blessings of grace and salvation are bestowed,—to wit, by the outpouring of the Spirit. Both of these designs appear in John's baptism; as well as in that of the Christian church.

2. Hence none are entitled to it except those who are embraced in the covenant, that is, believers and their households;

and it is to be administered to none who do not give scriptural evidence that they are heirs of the promises of the covenant. See Matt. iii. 7, 8. Hence, to hearers of the word, the conditions of the covenant are repentance and faith. Mark xvi. 16, Acts ii. 38, (comp. 41), xvi. 31—34.

3. These graces are fruits of the renewing of the Holy Spirit, and being made antecedent conditions of baptism, it is hence evident that the baptism which is enjoined as subsequent to faith, is not the baptism of the Spirit; since the latter precedes faith, and is its cause. It must, therefore, mean baptism with water, the seal of the blessings of the covenant. But to return:

“Tarry at Jerusalem,” said Jesus, “until ye be endued with power from on high.” The day of Pentecost comes, and the baptism of power descends. The multitude are gathered, and, under the preaching of Peter, cry, “What shall we do?” Peter replies, “Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost, for the promise [of Joel] is to you and to your children, &c.” Acts ii. 38. Thus Peter utters the very testimony which he and the other apostles and John had been accustomed to deliver when they baptized with water, and preached “the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.” Mark i. 4. Compare Mark i. 15, John iii. 22, iv. 2. The only change in the language is, that instead of ὁ ἐρχόμενος, the coming One, Peter now proclaims the name and kingdom of the Lord Jesus, as already come. Acts ii. 33—36.

Thus, we have still no hint of a change in the use of the word *baptism*. On the contrary, the phraseology, identical with that of John’s preaching, must have suggested to the hearers a similar baptism,—a washing with water.

Further, the baptism and the gift of the Holy Ghost are broadly distinguished from each other. The one is urged as a duty, conjoined with repentance. The other is announced as a promised gift from God,—that gift of which Joel spake, as conveying miraculous powers. The baptism enjoined, and the promise given, cannot, therefore, be the same thing. The one is antecedently conditional to the other.

Macnair’s interpretation presents Peter absurdly saying, Acquire the Holy Ghost, and thereupon ye shall receive it!

Upon condition that ye become sanctified, ye shall then receive sanctifying grace!

In short, the fact that the gift of the Spirit, here spoken of, is that extraordinary outpouring promised by Joel, (compare vs. 17—20, and 38, 39,) shows this not to be the baptism which is to be administered to all believers.

Thus far, we have no hint of a change of usage, as to the word which formerly designated water baptism; of the Saviour commissioning his followers to administer any other; or, of their pretending to baptize with the Spirit.

We will now notice the cases in which it is acknowledged by Macnair, that water baptism was used by the disciples, after the ascension of our Lord.

First is the case of the Samaritans who were baptized by Philip,—Acts viii. 12—17,—with which is properly to be associated that of the Ethiopian eunuch,—vs. 26—39. Upon these cases the following points are to be observed:

1. Macnair insinuates a doubt whether Philip was especially endowed with the Holy Ghost. Nothing could be more conclusive evidence of unwillingness to receive the truth, contrary to his own opinions. When the apostles directed the multitude of disciples to select “seven men full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom,” to superintend the ministration to the widows, Philip was the second man chosen by the multitude, and approved by the apostles, at a time when the whole body of disciples was realizing the full baptism of the day of Pentecost. Compare Acts iv. 31, v. 32, vi. 3. Upon the persecution following Stephen’s martyrdom, Philip was driven from Jerusalem; and at Samaria preached Christ, the Spirit attesting his ministry with signs and wonders wrought by him. An angel of the Lord commanded him to go to the place where he met the eunuch; the Spirit directed him to join with the Ethiopian; and, immediately after the baptism, the Spirit caught him up and bore him away, so that the rejoicing eunuch saw him no more. And yet Macnair questions whether he was a man taught of the Holy Ghost!

2. Peter and John were sent by the apostles at Jerusalem, to Samaria, to confer upon the believing Samaritans the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost. They found that they were all

baptized; and laying their hands upon them, the Holy Ghost was given. If the water baptism had been wrong, surely it would have been condemned by Peter and John. Certainly, they had the Holy Spirit, in the fullest measure. Compare Acts ii. 14—40; iii. 1—26; iv. 8, 31; v. 1—10, 15, &c. Yet, upon the visit of the apostles to Samaria, we have not a hint of the mistake of Philip being corrected by them. On the contrary, immediately after, Philip baptizes the eunuch in the same mode; and, in like manner, Peter baptizes Cornelius.

3. Here, then, we have the concurrent testimony of Peter, John, and Philip, in favour of water baptism. In the case of the eunuch, the Holy Spirit adds his authority, as a party to the baptism. He brings Philip to the eunuch, awaits his preaching of the gospel and administration of the baptismal seal, and then immediately bears him away; thus exhibiting to the eunuch a miraculous pledge of the Divine authority of the ministration of Philip. And yet we are told that the evangelist blundered in a cardinal point, and this in founding the gospel in Ethiopia. For the question between water and Spirit baptism must be fundamental. The assertion is an impeachment of the Holy Spirit, by whom Philip's ministry was so emphatically endorsed.

4. "The place of the Scripture" which the eunuch was reading, was in Isaiah liii. 7, 8. The section of Isaiah's prophecy in which this occurs, begins with chap. lii. 13, and includes that declaration, "So shall he sprinkle many nations," (chap. lii. 15)—language which points to baptism, and accounts for the request coming from the eunuch.

5. The testimony is express, that the Samaritans "had (*ὁπίσθον*, upon their first believing*) been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus," although the Holy Ghost was not fallen upon any of them. The command, therefore, to baptize into that name was fulfilled in the water baptism, and not in that of the Holy Ghost.

6. Macnair's argument from the case of Simon the sorcerer is futile. That there is a dead faith—a mere rational conviction, which is not saving—we are abundantly assured: Matt.

* Compare Phil. ii. 6: "Who, *ἰσάρχων*, being, at first,—originally,—in the form of God."

iii. 7, 8; James ii. 14—26; John xii. 42, 43. This kind of belief, however, is never called faith. Upon Macnair's own theory, he must admit that Simon's belief was not true faith; and the declaration of Jesus is emphatic: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." Mark xvi. 16. Thus he teaches us—upon failure of salvation—to look, not to a defective baptism, but to a failure of faith in the heart. And in the case of Simon, this is precisely where the defect was, Peter being witness: "Thy *heart* is not right in the sight of God."

7. In the history of Philip's ministry, we find the word *baptize* still employed, always to signify water baptism, as it was before the Spirit was given.

The next case of water baptism admitted by our author, is that of Cornelius and his house, by Peter. Macnair objects to Philip, that he was not an apostle; but he has as little respect for the authority of Peter as of Philip. He insists that the very vision which Peter had, in connection with his call to the house of Cornelius, shows him to have been steeped in a ceremonial spirit. Let us look at the facts.

1. Early in the ministry of our Saviour, upon occasion of Peter's profession of faith—"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God"—Jesus had said to him, "On this rock I will build my church; and [inasmuch as thou art first to recognize and profess this faith] I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," &c. Matt. xvi. 16—20. This promise was fulfilled, with respect to Israel, by the preaching of Peter on the day of Pentecost; and, with respect to the Gentiles, by the baptism of Cornelius. See Acts xv. 7. The transactions, therefore, connected with the case of Cornelius, have respect, not to him merely, or chiefly, but to the whole Gentile world. The door which the keys in Peter's hand opened to Cornelius, must be entered by all who desire a part with Cornelius in the son of David.

2. Proportionate to the importance of the occasion was the preparation for it,—the vision seen by Peter, giving him divine instruction as to what he should do; and the vision of Cornelius, directing him to send for Peter, and hear from him "what he ought to do." Acts x. 6.

3. Whilst Peter preached, the Holy Ghost fell upon his hearers; yet he is so far from recognizing that, as the baptism which he was commanded to administer, that he exclaims,—“Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we.” Acts xi. 47. The baptism of the Holy Ghost was not, then, that which the apostles were appointed to administer.

4. This case,—as well as those by Philip, which we have seen to have been acquiesced in by Peter and John,—shows the view taken of the subject by the apostles; especially by the pentecostal preacher; and consequently confirms our understanding of the baptism then administered, to those who believed at the preaching of Peter.

5. In the case of the Centurion we find every circumstance which should preclude a possibility of mistake as to the will of God. In answer to his continual prayers, Cornelius is directed by an angel to send for Peter, who should tell him what he ought to do, “whereby he and his house should be saved.” Peter receives special Divine instruction in preparation for his mission to Cornelius. The Spirit, already resting in fulness on him, is poured out upon the Centurion and his house. In the midst of such a scene, Peter commands the baptism of water to be administered. And yet we are told that, in so doing, he showed his ignorance of the meaning of the commission to baptize, given him on Olivet, by the ascending Saviour,—that he was controlled by a carnal and Judaizing spirit! If this be so, the Centurion was instructed by the Spirit of God to lean on a broken reed,—to receive and obey, as the voice of God, the mistaken requirements of an erring man!

Our next example occurs in the ministry of Paul, an authority of the highest importance, as his apostleship and his doctrine were derived immediately from the ascended Saviour, independent of any intercourse with the other apostles, and free from liability to have imbibed from them any errors which they may be supposed to have fallen into. See Gal. i. 1, 11—24, ii. 1—10. This apostle rejoices that he had baptized but few of the Corinthians, for, says he, “Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel.” 1 Cor. i. 17. Here Macnair thinks Paul asserts water baptism to be an ordinance of

man, and not of Christ, and that he yet admits himself to have sometimes administered it. But,

1. Whatever the word *baptize* properly means, that it is of which, if we suppose him to have understood his own words, Paul speaks. Our author admits that he did mean water baptism.

2. Paul rejoiced, not that the Corinthians were unbaptized;—to admit that some were, and yet deny it to have been administered to all, were preposterous;—but his joy was, that he, personally, had not administered the ordinance, but had left it to the hand of others.

3. The apostles had it as their distinctive office to bear witness to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, as a demonstration of his Messiahship. Whilst, in common with all ministers of the gospel, they were commanded to baptize,—they had special commission to proclaim the gospel of the risen Saviour; to testify as eye-witnesses to the fact of his resurrection, and confirm that testimony by miracles. See Acts i. 3, 8, 21, 22, ii. 32, x. 39—41, 1 Cor. ix. 1, 2 Cor. xii. 12, Heb. ii. 3, 4.

4. Hence, it would seem to have been common with the apostles to commit the baptizing of their converts to the hands of any other authorized persons, who might be present; thus recognizing the fellowship of the ministry. See Acts x. 48.

5. In thus doing, the apostles as fully complied with the terms of their commission, as though each one had, with his own hands, baptized all who were converted under his ministry.

6. This, further, restrained the tendency of carnal disciples to attach some importance to the person by whom they had been baptized.

7. Macnair attempts to find support in the language of Paul, (1 Cor. i. 22,) “For the Jews require a sign,” which he would interpret, “The Jews require baptism,—a ritual symbol or sign.” But such is not the meaning of the word *σημεῖον*, which signifies a demonstrative proof. See Matt. xvi. 1, xxiv. 3, 30, xxvi. 48, &c. Paul, therefore, has no reference, in that word, to baptism; but to that trait in the Jewish character, of which Jesus says, “Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe.” John iv. 48.

The conclusion, therefore, is, that Paul, the great opponent of Judaizing ritual and ceremonial observances, did baptize with his own hands some of the Corinthians with water,—an observance to which he could not have been led, but by the express authority of Christ. Gal. i. 1, 11, 12, ii. 6. This, too, in perfect consistency with the fact that he rejoiced in having cultivated the fellowship of the gospel, by committing the ordinance, in most cases, to the hands of other ministers; thus providentially cutting the Corinthians off from that ground of boasting of his name.

Further, we have thus an unquestionable exposition of the language of Acts xviii. 8, respecting the baptism of those who believed at Corinth. If Paul understood what the word *baptize* meant,—if Luke, the writer of the Acts, truly records the facts,—the baptism of the Corinthians was water baptism. And when, in the very next chapter, we find it stated of certain believers at Ephesus, that they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus, (Acts xix. 5,)—when this baptism is expressly contradistinguished from the baptism of power by the Holy Ghost, and brought into immediate connection with the baptism of John, both being expressed by the same word, baptize, the conclusion is inevitable, that the Ephesians were baptized as were the Corinthians, with water.

In this connection are to be included two additional places, in which it is admitted that the words *baptism* and *baptize* signify the application of water, viz., 1 Cor. x. 1, 2, and Heb. ix. 10.

And now let us glance at the leading points of the conclusions to which we have, thus far, come.

1. We have seen that baptism with water is a type and seal of that with the Holy Ghost.

2. That whilst the latter is essential in order to true conceptions respecting the kingdom of God, the baptism with water, our Saviour being witness, (John iii. 5), is essential to admittance into the visible organization of that kingdom.

3. That throughout the ministry of John and Christ, until the coming of the Spirit, the words, *baptize* and *baptism*, when used without adjuncts, designate baptism with water.

4. That at a time when this usage confessedly still existed, the Saviour commanded his disciples to baptize all nations.

5. That the baptism of power, promised by Christ to his disciples and realized by them on the day of Pentecost, and by others subsequently through the laying on of their hands, was an extraordinary influence, not to be confounded with "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost;" which is common to all the elect, whilst the other was peculiar to the apostolic age, and to certain chosen persons.

6. That this extraordinary, miraculous, and occasional baptism of the Holy Spirit, which disappeared from the church with the death of the apostles, is the only spiritual baptism of which the Scriptures speak, as attendant upon the laying on of hands.

7. That on the day of Pentecost, the reception of baptism was urged as a duty correlative with repentance; whilst the miraculous gift of the Spirit was announced as a promise, to be realized subsequent to repentance and baptism.

8. That Peter, John, Philip, and Paul, did confessedly baptize with water; and that, too, when under the extraordinary influence and guidance of the Spirit, who gave evidence of his approval, by miracles wrought in immediate and marked connection with the baptisms.

9. That especially was this the case in connection with the baptism of Cornelius; which was the opening of the doors of the kingdom to the whole Gentile world.

10. That by Peter, Philip, the Eunuch, and Paul, the word *baptize* is recognized as significant of water baptism,—is familiarly employed to express it, and, when so employed, is never accompanied with an explanatory adjunct, as though it might mean, of itself, something else.

11. That Luke, both in his Gospel and in the Acts, uses the same mode of expression wherever water baptism is alluded to.

12. That in one place (Acts xviii. 8,) in which no express mention is made of water in the history given by Luke, Paul himself testifies, as Macnair acknowledges, that water baptism was administered.

13. That the usage in respect to the words baptize and bap-

tism, as expressive of water baptism, is acknowledged by Macnair to prevail throughout the Gospels;—that no notice of a change in this usage occurs anywhere;—and that it in fact prevails throughout the Acts, in every instance of water baptism admitted by Macnair, and is still retained even in the Epistles. See 1 Cor. x. 1, 2, Heb. ix. 10.

Baptism is spoken of about eighty times in the New Testament. Of these about forty-one occur in the Gospels, where it is admitted that the word, by itself, signifies water baptism; some twenty-six are in the Acts, where in two instances an adjunct is used, to express spiritual baptism; in sixteen, it is admitted by Macnair that the circumstances render it unquestionable that water baptism is meant; in the other cases no adjunct is used; and yet Macnair asserts that they all mean spiritual baptism, although there is nothing in any one of the places to imply such a deviation from the universal usage as to the phraseology; and one of them is the case of the Corinthians, of whom we have Paul's testimony that they were baptized with water,—a testimony the more significant, as the apostle does not in terms name water at all, but Macnair is compelled from the nature of the apostle's argument to admit that he speaks of water baptism. The remaining instances in which the words occur, are in the epistles. In some of them, water baptism is unquestionably meant, and in others the adjuncts employed and the statements made show that the baptism of the Spirit is intended.

In short, in about sixty-six instances in which the words occur in the history of the beginning of the gospel, as given in the Evangelists and Acts, we have inspired interpretations which are admitted by Macnair to be conclusive in fifty-seven cases. Among these, a solitary case does not occur, in which the word baptism or baptize is used alone to express spiritual baptism. In no case is either word accompanied with an adjunct, when water baptism is meant; except where the design is to emphasize the distinction, where it is brought into immediate contrast with that of the Spirit. In the remaining places in which the word occurs, in the history of the apostolic age, there is nothing to forbid the word to be interpreted as in all the other places. Further, our Saviour,—speaking at a time

when the word, used without adjunct, is admitted by Macnair to have meant water baptism and nothing else,—uses it alone in the commission, “Go, baptize all nations;” the apostles go forth in fulfilment of this commission, and baptize all who received their testimony. In repeated instances, we have incidental proof that, by baptism, they understood that with water to be meant, and did in fact administer it; and, in no case, is there anything inconsistent with this interpretation.

THE CONCLUSION IS INEVITABLE, to those who take the Scriptures as their guide, that in the church which is built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, there are two baptisms,—the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and that with water; the one, promised by the Son of God, and administered by him alone; the other, commanded by him, and administered in his name, and as a testimony to his saving grace, by his apostles and other ministers; and to be administered by his servants, until his second coming;—the one, in its own nature, essential to salvation; the other, a duty commanded by Christ, neglect of which is a sin, which, if wilful, implies destitution of renewing grace, and consequently loss of the soul;—the one, constituting a bestowal of eternal life upon the soul; the other, a public testimony to the source of that life, the manner of its bestowment, and the effects thence resulting.

Macnair appeals to the “one baptism,” of Eph. iv. 5, as excluding that with water. The apostle, as Macnair states, is insisting upon the unity of believers, as an argument of mutual love. “I beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.” Eph. iv. 1—6. The question present to the apostle’s mind brings up such points as attest the unity of believers, and, in respect to baptism determines nothing more than that they are not separated by diverse kinds of baptism, one being baptized into one thing and another into something different; but “by one

Spirit are we all," (with one baptism) "baptized into one body." 1 Cor. xii. 13. To assert, as does our author, that this language is inconsistent with the supposition that there is a typical baptism, with water, as well as the essential baptism of the Spirit, is to ignore and contradict the fact that, Macnair himself being witness, Paul did himself unquestionably administer baptism with water, as did the other apostles; and that he designates that ministration by the bare word, baptism. If, indeed, we were to admit as Macnair pretends, that some of the early converts were baptized with water, and others were not, we should then have a diversity of baptisms, contrary to the apostle's statement, and inconsistent with the unity of the church; which is the point of his appeal. The phrase "one baptism," as used by the apostle probably comprehends both that of water and that with the Spirit. "One Lord, one faith, a baptism one in the Spirit given, and the graces conferred, and one in the visible sign and seal." The argument of Macnair is puerile, in which he asserts that "baptism with water is not one, but manifold, administered sometimes in infancy, sometimes in manhood, sometimes by sprinkling, sometimes by immersion, sometimes with other ceremonies, and sometimes without," &c. He might have added the difference of sex to that of age. But are all cases of spiritual baptism at the same age? Then, in the first place, the assumption is altogether unwarranted, that it ever was administered, in the apostolic age, otherwise than by affusion; and, in the second, if water baptism be, as our writer himself represents it,—such an application of water as shows forth the renewing influences of the Spirit upon the soul,—the distinctions mentioned above are merely circumstantial,—the baptism is one.

In short, by the direct admission of this writer, the baptism which is spoken of in the last command of the ascending Saviour is to be administered to all believers, and dispensed to them by the hands of Christ's disciples. From the ministry is the baptism to be received; and to them, therefore, must men come to enjoy it. The alternative is, that lost sinners are to look,—not to the Son of God, himself, for the Spirit of renewing, cleansing, and sanctifying grace,—but to men like themselves, upon whose faithfulness, and superabundant investiture

with the Spirit, their salvation is made to depend;—or, that the baptism which the ministry is to dispense is that of water; whilst, as at first, so still, the Son of God himself is the baptizer with the Holy Ghost, to whom men must come for salvation, and from whom alone is to be obtained “the Spirit of life.” The one theory invites men to trust in an arm of flesh; the other, in the love of Christ. The former system is antichrist. The latter is the gospel of the Son of God.

Faithfulness to the truth of Christ forbids us to close, without distinctly marking the sceptical spirit which inspires Macnair’s entire book. Whilst professing to accept the word of God as the infallible guide, he does not hesitate to reject the testimony of those very apostles to whom Jesus expressly says, “Whoso heareth you, heareth me.” He quibbles about the vision and misrepresents Peter, as though he was hard to persuade to call no man common or unclean. Whereas, the simple fact is, that the vision and expostulation of Peter was respecting the eating of all manner of wild beasts and reptiles. The meaning of this vision was not at first revealed to Peter, (Acts x. 17,) and was only imparted to him, upon the coming of the messenger of Cornelius, with whose summons Peter, without a moment’s hesitation, complied. But what must be the writer’s estimate of the wisdom, faithfulness, and power of God, whom he admits to have used such special care, in preparing Peter for his mission to Cornelius, and inducing in Cornelius an implicit trust in Peter, as one who would “tell him what he ought to do;” and yet permit Peter to commit a signal blunder, which implies utter mistake as to the meaning of the very commission under which he went forth to preach, given him by the ascending Saviour, on Mount Olivet! In one word, either were the apostles protected from all error in their official instructions and actions, or the Bible is to be rejected as a rule of faith; since we have no criterion of truth, if there be error there. Either are they infallible guides, or they are nothing, and the Bible a fable. It is said that they did sometimes err, as Peter at Antioch, (Gal. ii. 11;) but, in the first place, the case was of private, and not of official conduct. As an apostle, he had the pledge of guidance into all truth. As an individual, he was not yet perfect. And, in the second

place, we should never have known of that error, but for the inspired record condemning it. Thus we are assured, that had the apostles erred in more important matters, the mistakes would have been distinctly pointed out, and not left on the sacred page, to ensnare and mislead the people of God.

In one word, by the distinct admission of our author himself, he and the apostles differ on the subject of baptism. They administered it with water, in the name of the blessed Three, as commanded by Jesus. He thinks they ought not so to have done. The authority of Christ and the apostles is on one side. On the other is our author. The reader will choose between them.

ART. VI.—*The General Assembly.*

THE General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States met agreeably to appointment in Newark, New Jersey, May 19th, 1864; and, in absence of Dr. Morrison, the Moderator of the last Assembly, was opened by a sermon by William L. Breckinridge, D. D., on 2 Cor. viii. 9. After the usual preliminary services, James Wood, D. D., of Indiana, was chosen Moderator and Ravaud K. Rodgers, D. D., of New Jersey, Temporary Clerk.

Report on Psalmody.

J. Trumbull Backus, D. D., chairman of the committee on this subject, made a report included in the following resolutions, which, after protracted and desultory debate, were adopted.

Resolved, 1. That a selection of psalms and hymns be made from our present book, and from other sources, and published with suitable tunes; and that all the new hymns in this new selection, which are not in our present book, be published as a *supplement*, for the use of those who prefer it; and that the hymns in the new selection, in addition to their own numbers, shall