

←-THE→

# Twelve Ws of Baptism

Lectures Delivered to Theological Class

-----OF-----

HALL-MOODY INSTITUTE

**Editor's Explanatory Note:** I have scanned this book and re-formatted the content while trying to maintain chapter integrity. Page numbers listed in the contents will not match, but the content is, as written, in the chapters listed. – Leon King.

by J. B. MOODY, D.D., Dean

MARTIN, TENN.

PRICE:

Paper Cover, 25c; Muslin, 50c, Prepaid

## ALSO AUTHOR OF

(Nashville Debate, price \$2.00); (Distinguishing Baptist Doctrines, 75c); After Death, 50c; Sin—Salvation and Service, 25c; Love the Greatest, 20c; Sin, 10c; Co-operation of Churches, 10c; (Church Government, 10c); (Baptist Authors Vindicated, 10c); (Vindication Concerning and Containing the Anderson Letters, 5c); (The Name Christian, 10c); The Two Covenants, 10c; (The Great Salvation, 5c;) (The Culpability of Ignorance, 5c)

These in parenthesis cannot be furnished,

-----  
1906

=====  
MARSHALL & BRUCE CO.  
PRINTERS and PUBLISHERS  
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE  
=====

# CONTENTS.

## CHAPTER I.

The WHICH of the Baptisms is the One Baptisms . . . . . 7 - 13

## CHAPTER II.

The WHENCE of Water Baptism . . . . . 14 - 16

## CHAPTER III.

The WHAT of Baptism? ("All Righteousness.") . . . . . 17 - 29  
Essential and Nonessential . . . . . 29 - 31

## CHAPTER IV.

The WHEN of Baptism . . . . . 32 - 33

## CHAPTER V.

The WHERE of Baptism . . . . . 34 - 35

## CHAPTER VI.

The WHOM of Baptism . . . . . 52 - 53  
Campellite Immersions . . . . . 41 - 50  
Antimissionary Immersions . . . . . 50 - 51

## CHAPTER VII.

The WHOM of Baptism . . . . . 52 - 53

## CHAPTER VIII.

The WHY of Baptism . . . . . 54 - 59  
Baptize eis Remission . . . . . 59 - 64

## CHAPTER IX.

The WAY TO Baptism . . . . . 65 - 68  
Positive Hindrances . . . . . 68 - 77  
Possible Hindrances . . . . . 77 - 86

CHAPTER X.

The WAY OF Baptism . . . . . 87 - 100  
POUR . . . . . 90 - 93  
SPRINKLE . . . . . 93 - 95  
DIP . . . . . 95 - 100

CHAPTER XI.

The WAY FROM Baptism . . . . . 101 - 103

CHAPTER XII.

The WITNESSES ON Baptism . . . . . 104 - 130  
Lexicons . . . . . 104 - 105  
Testimony of Historians. . . . . 106 - 113  
Testimony of Encyclopedias . . . . . 113 - 116  
Jury of Twelve on Infant Baptism. . . . . 116 - 118  
Jury of Twelve Scholars on Immersions. . . . . 119 - 121  
Way Marks to Apostolic Baptism . . . . . 122 - 124

CHAPTER XIII.

Testimony of Conscience. . . . . 125 - 130  
Conclusion. . . . . 130 - 133

## PREFACE

ONE should be enjoined from introducing another book on Baptism along the old lines. A new truth may be tolerated in an old dress, but there is a demand for old truths in new dress. I have aimed to meet the latter, not that the old were insufficient in facts and arguments, but deficient in palatableness to a fastidious taste. I don't know that I have met the demand, but I trust that the new divisions and arrangement may tempt the appetite of some who may feel a longing for a better knowledge of this subject. These Twelve Ws of Water Baptism enable me to touch the subject, I trust, with sufficient clearness at every important point—doctrinal and practical. I have not followed my predecessors in this arrangement and presentation of the subject, but have drawn largely from many of them for the facts and testimonies presented. This general acknowledgment is cheerfully made.

## CHAPTER I.

### THE TWELVE WS OF BAPTISM.

**T**HE Which; the Whence; What; Why; Who; Whom; When; Where; Way to; Way of; Way from; and Witnesses on. This twelvefold division of the subject will permit us to touch all points that modern use and abuse may demand. As the Scriptures mention baptisms, we will first determine the

#### WHICH

of these we are to consider. Jewish ablutions are referred to in Mark 7:48; Luke 11:38; and Heb. 9:10, and the word for baptize is translated "wash," which was done by immersing. The plural "baptisms" is found in Heb. 6:2, which may include baptism in the Holy Spirit mentioned in Matt. 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:33; Acts 1:5; 11:16. The results of this baptism may be referred to in 2d, 8th, and 19th chapters of Acts, but not as commonly supposed in 1 Cor 12:13. Instead of "by" new translations read: "In one spirit were we all baptized unto one body."

There was also the baptism of suffering which Christ and some of his followers received. See Matt. 20:22, 23; Mark 10:38, 39; Luke 12:50. See also such passages as Matt. 19:29; Rev. 7:14; 20:4; Phil. 3:7-11, which may refer to "those who are counted worthy to obtain that age," and the "first or better resurrection," through a baptism of suffering.

There is also the baptism of fire, or in fire, which is reserved for the impenitent. See Matt. 3: to; 7:19; 13:40, 42, 50; 18:8, 9; 25:41; Mark 9:42, 43, 44, 46; Luke 16:24; Rev. 19:20; 20:10, 14, 15. Many pray for the baptism of fire, but they know not what they say or do.

As there was no baptism of, by, or with water, but always in water (*en hudati*), so there is no baptism of, with, or by the Holy Spirit, but in the Holy Spirit. As water was poured into the basin for the washing of Jesus' feet, and may be poured into a pool for baptizing, so the Holy Spirit was poured out from heaven and came like a rushing, violent wind and filled

the whole house in which they were sitting, and thus they were immersed, submerged, buried, overwhelmed. The pouring out was not the baptism.

The Holy Spirit, suffering, fire, and water are elements in which the baptisms occur; hence the baptisms are not by these, or with these, but in these. The King James Version is often misleading on controverted points, and is often the cause of much and most of the controversies. The Holy Spirit in the Greek spoke rightly, and a faithful translation, with a love and knowledge of the truth, would soon end the controversies—a consummation greatly to be desired.

But "first pure, then peaceable." Christian unity must be in accordance with truth, and to this end controversy should be aimed. While this book will necessarily be controversial, yet its aim will be the unity prayed for by Christ in John 17:11, 17-23, and urged by Paul in I Cor. 1:10. May writer and readers be imbued with the spirit of truth and unity.

Now out of the divers baptisms, and doctrines of baptism, which fulfilled their purposes, but one is left for us—viz., Water Baptism; or, more correctly, baptism in water, as the one and only baptism remaining. When Paul wrote in Eph. 4:5, "One Lord, one faith, one baptism," the others were ended, and that of fire was reserved for the last day, when the ungodly shall be cast into the lake burning with fire and brimstone. The whole multitude were to be baptized, some in water and the Spirit, and the others in fire. This last, and Jewish baptisms, are mentioned in the gospel, but they are not of the gospel. Some of the ancients may have been baptized in the Holy Spirit when they prophesied and wrought miracles, as credentials from God. So the first church at Jerusalem (Acts 2:1-4); the first converts in Samaria (Acts 8:15-17); the first Gentile converts in Caesarea (Acts 10:44-48); and the first in Asia (Acts 19:1-6). After these attestations from God, credentials were no longer necessary.

## **BAPTISM IN WATER**

is the baptism of the commission, to continue to the consummation of the age. This is the

## WHICH

of the baptisms we are going to study in the light of the other eleven Ws.

No other subject has been so abused, confused, and misused, and no other contains and explains so much vital truth. But the rubbish of contention and the rust of neglect hide much of its marrow and fatness. Perhaps more saints have laid down their lives for this doctrine than for any other; and, as usual, the errorists have been the persecutors, and those who held the truth have suffered the martyrdom.

Errorists have always been the most zealous, and the most intolerant, and the most successful (seemingly). It has been estimated that one hundred millions of martyrs have been put to death for the gospel's sake, and perhaps more than half of the number was for the truths contained in the doctrine of baptism. W. B. Godbey on Revelation, page 54, says: "Romanism, in the dark succession of the pagan emperors, who had slaughtered one hundred millions of saints, comes on and slays one hundred millions more." On page 58, he says: "Two hundred millions of God's martyrs have already sealed their testimony with their blood since the prophet saw this vision." Many writers estimate one hundred millions. Mosheim, on page 493, says: "In almost all the countries of Europe, an unspeakable number of these unhappy wretches (Anabaptists) preferred death in its worst forms to a retraction of their errors," and "not because they were rebellious subjects, but for limiting baptism to adults only, and for rebaptizing such as had received that sacrament in a state of infancy." Yet it occurs to me that many Baptists of today think it is better to surrender to those who pout at them and contend no longer; but that is not the stuff that the martyrs were made of.

Many Baptist churches in England accept sprinkling and pouring for baptism, and receive such into full fellowship in their churches; not because they have been convinced, but conquered! The pouts of pedobaptists have made them cowards. Not many churches in this country are yet receiving such in a direct way, but indirectly, which is



more disastrous. That is to say, immersion is essential to church membership, but many Baptists call religious bodies churches though they have not immersion. This should never be done in a way that would neutralize our position on that subject. When in a summary of world wide missionary statistics and work, all nominal Christianity is counted, and all denominational churches without distinction are reckoned, with all of their so-called baptisms as they count them, does not such a statement in a Baptist report of mission work do injustice to the Baptist position, and is it not injurious to the truth. If we thus break down distinctions in our general reports, can we consistently maintain them in other ways. Baptists believe that Christ ordained a baptized ministry and ordinarily they require it, but there is a growing custom among us now of treating unbaptized ministers with distinguishing courtesy. If we would refuse one who is wanting in certain ceremonial qualifications, and exclude our own for believing and practicing certain doctrines, is it not inconsistent and injurious to the truth to teach and practice contrary to these principles? Is it not wrong to profess to believe that baptism is a prerequisite to the Lord's Supper, and then practice differently? Yet, as the writer sees it, this tide of liberalism is dangerously on the increase. Not that such Baptists have been convinced, but conquered; they are not converts, but cowards. Yet God will not leave himself without his remnant of faithful witnesses, of which I crave to be one. I had rather be a martyr than a traitor.

It is a well settled belief among Baptists that an administrator of baptism ought himself to have received it and to believe in it. But the writer apprehends a growing disposition among us to ignore the doctrine we profess by receiving immersions known to have been administered by the unbaptized, and he fears that strife and division will come in our churches, and among our churches, if the ordinance is to be kept as delivered. So as Heb. 6 : 1, 2 is supposed to classify baptism as one of the rudimental doctrines of the gospel—the first to preach to the young convert— and as some of you are beginners in theological study, I thought it my duty, and esteem it a great pleasure, to indoctrinate you in this ordinance which contains both the milk and the strong meat of the gospel.

What our Dr. J. M. Frost says in that excellent book called "Moral Dignity of Baptism," should be preached all over the land. But it must first be reached before it can be preached. As I said, there is now no baptism by the Spirit, or of, or with, or in the Spirit, yet baptism is spiritual, and without that the letter killeth. But the spiritual must be expressed through the literal, as baptism has both letter and spirit; it may have the letter and not the spirit, but it can't have the spirit and not the letter. So let us begin at the right place, and in the right way, and go on to Dr. Frost's "Moral Dignity of Baptism," which is only his way of expressing the spiritual or weightier features of baptism.

If there is at present a baptism of, or by, or in the Spirit, and there is but "one baptism," then, of course, that should be the one, and Water Baptism should drop out. This many believe. But the commission, and the practice and writings of the apostles and early Christians, settle this matter so as to leave all without excuse.

We read the history of Water Baptism in Acts, chapters 8, 9, 10, 16, 18, 19, 20; Rom. 6; I Cor. 1, 10, 12, 15 ; Gal. 3 ; Col. 2 ; Heb. to ; and I Pet. 3 : 24, 25. Then in all ecclesiastical histories of the first centuries. Baptism in the Holy Spirit enabled the subject. to speak with tongues, prophecy and heal, but Paul its seems let Epaphroditus continue "sick, nigh unto death," and had to wait on God to heal him, as we do now. There is no history of such baptisms after 19th of Acts.

So the WHICH of the baptisms is clearly Water Baptism, or baptism in water, to which the remaining Ws Will be applied.

## CHAPTER II.

### The WHENCE of Water Baptism

"The baptism of John—WHENCE was it; from heaven or of men?" This was in answer to the question, "By what authority doest thou these things, and who gave thee this authority?" Here Jesus swapped questions. He said: "Answer mine and I will answer yours." This he said, because in answering his they would have answered their own.

What authority had John to baptize? Men could not authorize a baptism like John's. John stood against the religion and theology of his day. The people thought that succession from Abraham, to whom, and his seed, the promises were made, with morality and ceremonials, was enough. But John demanded better fruit than that. In addition to all this, he demanded repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ, and baptism in water as the profession of these, and of remission of sins before obtained. So that in baptism they were compelled to acknowledge that their high claim of lineage, ceremonies, and blood of bulls and goats, left them still in their sins, which he required them to repent of, and look to another source for forgiveness.

The Jews knew that the Sanhedrin gave no such authority, and no other authority would have done such a thing, and therefore the only conclusion left was, that John was sent of God to baptize.

Besides, God had given John the seal of success in a genuine reformation that included the vital essentials, and that brought forth the right kind of fruit, which prepared a people for baptism and for the Lord's use in the Lord's church.

"And all the people that heard, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him." Luke 7: 29, 30. This is just as true today. Those justify God who have been

baptized with the baptism of John, because God sent him to baptize as he did. Those who refuse to be baptized with the baptism of John, reject the counsel of God against themselves. God has never authorized any other baptism than John's. It is the only baptism in the world that is from heaven. All that Jesus and the disciples baptized were with John's baptism. It is all he and the apostles had, or have. If that is not valid, then we have no baptized Lord Jesus Christ. I love to think of him on the mediatorial throne, and him and the apostles in the age to come, sitting on terrestrial thrones of authority, CLOTHED IN JOHN'S BAPTISM. I don't want any better or any other. The phrase "Christian baptism," in contradistinction to "John's baptism," is of man, if not of the devil. John's baptism is the only baptism for all time. Hence, when Christ gave the commission he did not put baptize in the imperative, as though he were commanding a new kind, but in the participial form— "baptizing them"— and that meant a continuance of the baptism he and they had received from John the Baptist. There was no change made. If John's baptism fulfilled all righteousness, then why change it? Who could make it better? It is the only baptism that is from heaven, and those who reject it, and prefer something from men, reject the counsel of God against themselves, and must take the consequences, whatever they may be. Sprinkling babies and immersing sinners are not from heaven, but of men.

There is but one answer to the WHENCE of the one baptism. It is from HEAVEN.

If God sent Luther and Henry, and Calvin, and Wesley, and Campbell, etc., to set up their churches, and creeds, and baptisms, then he sent the Mormons, and Spiritists, and Mrs. Eddy, etc., etc.; also the Catholics, Greek and Roman, for they have the same credentials the others claim, and that more abundantly—viz., 'success.' The more error one holds, the more zeal he has in propagating it. And hence the more seeming success. But only that is success that survives the fiery test at the last day. Error is swift, runs greedily after it, while truth must conquer every inch of the way. I speak from experience as well as observation.

## CHAPTER III.

### THE WHAT OF WATER BAPTISM.

If it is from heaven, there is something in it. It is a "likeness," but of WHAT? A "figure," but of WHAT? A "form," but of WHAT? "Unto WHAT were ye baptized? Unto John's Baptism? John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on (*eis*) him that should come after him, that is, on (*eis*) Christ Jesus." As John's baptism required more than the baptism of these twelve disciples, then they must be baptized rightly. Acts 19:2-5. It does not say, with WHICH were ye baptized, John's or Christian baptism? But unto (*eis*) What? They answered, unto (*eis*) the WHAT of John's baptism, or unto that, unto What John baptized. No other answer seems theologically possible. Then for the WHAT of John's baptism we turn to Matt. 3:15: "*Thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness.*" Then in some sense, and that must be an important sense, we are to fulfill all righteousness in baptism.

There are but two ways we can fulfill all righteousness in one act, and they are really or symbolically. I should have said figuratively, but here the figure is both symbolical and typical, one looking backward and the other forward. If all righteousness is this WHAT of baptism, then what a WHAT that WHAT must be!

Again, if fulfill means to fill full, and all righteousness of the past, present, and future is contained in the WHAT, then it is becoming in us to enquire UNTO WHAT we were baptized.

The only difference I can see in the baptism of John and that in the commission is the addition of the name of the Holy Spirit in the formula. Before this he had not been given executive administratorship, because Christ had not gone away. But see how John spoke of the Holy Spirit in Matt. 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16. He saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove. John 1:32, 33. John was filled with the Holy Spirit from his mother's womb. Luke 1:15. His mother, during pregnancy, was filled with

the Holy Spirit, which caused the babe to leap, doubtless with joy, before his birth. See how his father, filled with the Holy Spirit, prophesies of him in Luke 1:66-80. Also the work of the Holy Spirit in Luke 2:25-27; 3:16, 22; 4:1, 14, 18, etc.—all during John's day. John's baptism required repentance towards God and faith in Christ to come, and ours in the same Christ who did come. So it does not follow that because they knew only John's baptism, "they did not know whether there be any Holy Spirit," as the Common Version reads; but they did not know of his Pentecostal coming, with mighty signs and wonders, promised by John and Christ and the prophets, and that to give gifts unto men. When they were taught the word of the Lord more perfectly, as Apollos had been on this subject, they were then "baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Then "Paul laid his hands on them, and the Holy Spirit came on them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied."

Thus they knew the dispensation of the Spirit, and that he had come in his executive vicegerency, and they could render him co-honor with the Father and the Son.

John's baptism was fully endorsed by Paul in Acts 19:4, as it was all it ought to have been before the Spirit publicly and formally assumed co-administratorship with the Father and the Son; and the "signs" were his credentials from Christ to men. John's baptism was valid baptism, and the baptism of Peter and Paul was valid baptism, and things equal to the same thing are equal to each other. The ignorance of these disciples concerning the Holy Spirit must not be charged to John, nor to John's baptism, but to their teachers, or to their residence in a far-off, heathen country. I would not defend John's baptism as these heathen understood it, but as John and Christ and the apostles understood it. Christ said that all righteousness was fulfilled in it, and it becomes the "us" of all time to so fulfill it.

Let us now see what all righteousness requires and how it was and is fulfilled. Let us begin at the very beginning of all righteousness, and proceed in regular order to the very end.

All righteousness requires that men shall know God, and themselves, and the sin that dwells in them. To this end the law, which is holy, perfect, just, and good, was given, and "by it is the knowledge of sin." Paul said in Rom. 7:7 that "he had not known sin but by the law." That "when the commandment came sin revived and he died." That "sin by the commandment became exceeding sinful." That even his blameless righteousness that was in the law must be "counted as loss." The Pharisees and Sadducees boasted of their law of righteousness and their descent from Abraham. The covenants and the promises were theirs, and they thought they needed no repentance. But John told them better; that they must repent like other sinners of the Gentiles, and show fruits meet for repentance. That the blood of bulls and goats left them in their sins, and that they must look to the "Lamb of God," promised since the world began for redemption from sin. The Holy Spirit sealed his words with convicting power, so that their very baptism was a confession of sins from which their consciences were not purged by their continual sacrifices. Self-righteous 'as they were, they came to a knowledge of sin which multitudes tried to purge by the addition of baptism. But John told them to repent, and show the' fruits of it, or they would be cut down and cast into the fire of hell. All righteousness requires that all moralists and all self-righteous persons shall repent as other sinners. See how the righteous Paul repented in Acts 9: 9-11. Read his description of his own case in Rom. 7: 7-13, and Christ's description of repentance in his allusion to the Ninevites. The heathen jailer was satisfied with his religion the day before his conversion; but when "God wrought through Paul to make the Gentiles obedient in word and deed by mighty signs and wonders and by the power of the Spirit of God" (Rom. 15: 18, 19), the jailer felt he was a lost sinner, and he wanted to know what he must do to be saved. So in baptism we confessed that the law gave us knowledge of sin, which caused us to seek salvation, as all righteousness requires.

2. All righteousness requires also REPENTANCE toward God. John's baptism said that was fulfilled. They were baptized *eis* repentance. Not baptized in order to repentance, but their baptism declared in symbol that that righteous demand had been met. Not only baptized unto repentance, but it was the baptism of repentance. And since these self-righteous

Pharisees thought they had no sins to repent of, that the law did not provide for, righteousness demanded that they should publicly confess their error. Hence, in being baptized unto repentance, and unto remission, they fully confessed what the law could not do, and which Christ came to do, and had done for them. "John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance." Acts 19:4. John's first recorded word of utterance was Repent. Matt. 3:2. So of Christ. Matt. 4:17. "He came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." So of the twelve. The rich man in Hades wanted repentance preached on earth by one from Hades. Repent was Peter's first imperative on the day of Pentecost. In public and in private, to Jews and Greeks, Paul preached Repentance toward God. All righteousness says, "Except ye repent ye shall perish." In baptism we profess to have fulfilled that' righteous demand and command.

3. All righteousness requires that we shall REPENT AND PRAY. God's forgiving mercy must be penitently sought. "There is no difference between Jew and Greek, for the same Lord is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." Rom. 10:12, 13. Cornelius prayed, and his prayer was heard. Paul prayed and fasted for three days and nights, and Acts 22:6 should read: "Arise, and have yourself baptized, having called upon the name of the Lord." So in baptism we say to this all-righteous demand: I have fulfilled it. "I called and He heard me."

4. Does all righteousness require FAITH IN CHRIST? John's baptism required that "they should believe on him that should come after him—that is, on Christ Jesus." John baptized believing penitents. Acts 19:4. So Cornelius and others believed and were baptized.

5. Does all righteousness require REMISSION OF SINS? John's baptism was unto remission of sins, or rather it was "the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins." As baptism *eis* repentance declared repentance as a fact, so baptism *eis* remission declared remission as a fact. As baptism professed the one, so it did the other. If one must precede, so must the other.



Peter said: "Repent, all of you, and let each one who repents be baptized, Trusting upon the name of the Lord for the remission of sins." Elder J. A. Harding, in the Nashville Debate, on page 456, says: "The man to whom Jesus gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven told convicted sinners to repent and be baptized, trusting in Jesus for the remission of sins." On page 560 he says: "And in answer to their cry he told them to repent, and be baptized, trusting in the name of Jesus for the remission of sins." Similar language is found on pages 57, 58, 458, 486, 497, 500, and 518. David Lipscomb has also publicly confessed conversion to the same rendering. It is the plain idiom of the Greek, having *epi* before the dative, which means not by the authority of Jesus—which is expressed differently—but it is RELIANCE UPON. This puts the text in harmony with Acts 10:43: "To him (Jesus) give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever BELIEVETH in him should receive remission of sins." See also Rom. 3:22-26. This *epi* before the dative is found also in Rom. 9:33; 10:11; 15:12; 1 Cor. 1:4; twice in 2 Cor. 1:9; 1 Tim. 1:16; 4:10; 1 Peter 2:6.

Believe upon the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Acts 16:31. Here it is *epi* before the accusative, but Rom. 4:5 shows that this is also without works, and simply trusting upon him.

6. But all righteousness requires not only a taking away of sins, but also a CLEANSING FROM SIN. The stains of sin are deep, dark, and damnable. All righteousness requires that these stains shall be "made whiter than snow." Hence, when "our hearts have been sprinkled from an evil conscience," or when "God purifies the heart by faith" in Jesus Christ, or when his blood has cleansed us from all sin, it is right that we should show it in the appointed way. Hence baptism is a washing away of sins. If baptism really washes away sins, then there is no other way. If baptism figuratively washes away sins, or if in baptism we confess this fact, as we did repentance and remission, then it does not really wash away sins. If "whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins," and if this faith comes before baptism, as in the case of Cornelius and his house, and if they were made so conscious of the fact that they praised and magnified God—all before baptism—then baptism becomes a

profession of sins washed away really by the blood of Christ, and symbolically in water: Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water. The blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin. So baptism professes a washing or cleansing from sin, as all righteousness demands.

7. Does all righteousness require LOVE TO GOD AND JESUS CHRIST? Baptism professes love as a fact. In response to the challenge, "If ye love me, keep my commandments:" and "if ye love me, you will," baptism professes such a love as a fact and a motive, and pledges it as an abiding principle that will lead into a future, and full, and ready, obedience.

8. Does all righteousness demand the DEATH OF CHRIST? Baptism declares it as a fact.

"Know ye not that as many of us as were baptized unto Jesus Christ, were baptized unto his death?" Without the death of Christ, God would not have been righteous in forgiving our sins. Without that as a fact, and our faith in it, our hope would be in vain, and our baptism a farce. Baptism declares our faith in the fact "that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he rose the third day according to the Scriptures." As he died for our sins, so he arose for our righteousness or justification. Hence his baptism fulfilled this righteousness by dying for our sins in prophetic pledge, and our baptism in historic fact.

9. Does all righteousness require the RESURRECTION OF CHRIST? and that so sternly, that without it our preaching is vain, our faith vain, and we still in our sins and would make us of all men most miserable? But Christ declared that his resurrection would follow his death. It was a typical fact, or fact in type, when Christ arose in baptism, and like all prophecy might have been stated in the present tense or past, as in the 53d of Isaiah. While it was not a real fact till he arose from the dead, yet it was a truth; as much before as since. John's baptism declared a fact that would be, and ours a fact that has been—both pointing to the same fact, though from different standpoints. The second coming of Christ is as

true now as it will ever be. It requires no more faith to believe the last three chapters of Revelation, than the first three in Genesis. They were both given by inspiration of God, and his revelations of the future and the past, both unseen to the writers, are equally credible. Our faith in either stands or falls with our faith in the other. John's baptism said Christ would rise indeed; ours says he did rise indeed, and they both answer alike to this requirement of all righteousness. Baptism says: "For if we were planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be raised also in the likeness of his resurrection."

10. Does all righteousness require our DEATH TO SIN? Baptism says: "Here it is." It shows it as a fact. "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead (to sin) is freed from sin," "Likewise reckon ye yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God." Rom. 6:6, 11. All righteousness could not demand less, and baptism could not answer less. In repentance we died to sin, and at faith we arose to a new life. Baptism declares this.

11. Does all righteousness require that we should WALK IN NEWNESS OF LIFE? Our baptism said, "That as Christ was raised up from the dead, EVEN SO SHOULD WE WALK IN NEWNESS OF LIFE." Rom. 6:4. Our baptism most solemnly pledges us to this newness of life, and that means we will not live the life we lived before, and it is better for a man to perjure himself in the oath he made to men, than in this most solemn oath of allegiance he made to God before so many witnesses. (See Eleventh W.)

12. Does all righteousness require our SEPARATION FROM THE WORLD? Not socially, for then we must needs get out of the world. But we must no longer run with them to do evil. We are still in the world, but we must not be of the world. "What fellowship has a believer with an unbeliever?" "Come out and be ye separate, saith the Lord." Now as baptism in the cloud and in the sea separated the Israelites from the Egyptians, so in our baptism we were buried out of the old world with which we had been identified, and came out into a new, hating our old

ways of sin and loving the life that is new. Sheep love to flock with sheep, and do not love to herd with swine. Loving God, and the people of God, we seek their company and companionship. It may require separation from father, mother, wife, children, etc. Baptism pledges us to such a separation if necessary.

13. Does all righteousness require a CIRCUMCISION OF HEART? Rom. 2:29 and Col. 2:11 speak of this, and the next verse connects it with baptism. Unless our heart is circumcised to love that which is right, our new walk and separation will endure only for a time, and soon we will fall away.

14. Does all righteousness require a GOOD CONSCIENCE? "Baptism is the answer of a good conscience." "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water." Heb. 10:22. Baptism says there is no longer a consciousness of sins.

15. Does all righteousness require a PUTTING ON OF CHRIST, so that he shall dwell both within and without? "As many as have been baptized unto Jesus Christ have put on Christ." This means that others seeing our conduct and hearing our conversation may take knowledge of us that we are the Lord's. We must not only be like Christ, but LIVE like Christ. See this life described in Rom. 6:16-23; 7:4; Col. 3:1-10, etc.

16. Does all righteousness require our bodily death? "It is appointed unto man once to die." "Death is yours," says Paul. As Christ yielded to his prophetic death in his baptism, so do we. We must be not only united with him in the likeness of his death, but in its reality. "Dust to dust" is our righteous inheritance professed in baptism. If death is righteously "appointed," it must be righteously obeyed. 2 Pet. 1:14, with John 21:18.

17. Does all righteousness require our faith in OUR OWN BODILY RESURRECTION from the grave? Baptism says, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive"--i. e., all the baptized ones—"when Christ comes." "Else what shall they do who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all?" If there is no resurrection, then we are all in our

sins. To say that the Scripture is true on one and not true on the other, is to make ourselves false witnesses of God, just as it would make God a liar if we believe not the record he has given of his Son. We can't believe inspiration in spots, and those who do, spot themselves and should be spotted by all believers, and so "marked" that all can "avoid them."

18. Does all righteousness require our RECOGNITION OF THE TRINITY? We were baptized unto the name of the sacred Three— Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. A Unitarian thus baptized perjures himself. If it can be said of any one that the truth is not in him, certainly it could be said of him who submitted to baptism in the use of this formula and then in public profession and preaching denies it.

19. Does all righteousness require our UNION WITH THE ONE BODY? "In one spirit were we all baptized unto one body." If one tells me he wishes baptism but not church membership, I would reply that Christ doesn't want it that way, and I am his servant. He wants the saved baptized, and added to the church, and baptism would not and could not be an all-righteous ordinance if it did not require it. So let every baptism be with respect to oneness with a body of Christ, which is the body of Christ. As a human body is THE human body, so is a body of Christ THE body of Christ.

THUS—that is, in baptism—we fulfill all righteousness, not only in its past, but in its future requirements, bringing every thought in subjection to the obedience of Christ. Thus in this thousand-tongued ordinance we emblematically profess and pledge all righteousness, both acquired and required.

20. Does all righteousness require Loyalty to the least as well as the greatest of Christ's Commandments? "Baptizing them, and teaching them to guard safely ALL THINGS WHATSOEVER I have commanded you." "Ye are my friends if ye do WHATSOEVER I command you," The baptized witnesses of Christ are pledged to this. Loyalty requires their unwavering protest to what is called

## **ESSENTIAL AND NON-ESSENTIAL.**

Which of the "all things whatsoever" are essential and non-essential?

From Rome, via England and Epworth and Germany and Geneva, to the United States, and from thence to the uttermost parts of the earth, comes and goes the answer that Christ's moral teachings are essential, but that his positive commandments are non-essential. There never was a more grievous error. The doctrines of Christ may be divided into vital and non-vital, but never into essential and non-essential; for while baptism is a non-vital doctrine—that is, life or salvation does not depend upon it—yet it is just as essential as if he had said, "Except ye be baptized ye cannot be saved." Obedience is essential to that for which it was appointed, whether it be unto life or unto happiness and rewards.

The law of morality was given by Moses, and God had in every city them that taught the law of Moses; but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. Christ did not teach any new morality, but he did teach a new obedience from the heart to all his commandments—the least as well as the greatest.

Moral law is reasonable rightness, yet obedience to it cannot be a test or proof of love to Christ. The moral law says thou shalt not kill, steal, lie, etc., and so say the statutes of all States and nations. Then it can't be known whether obedience to these is obedience to human statutes or Moses, or a law of necessity. The Jews were strict in their obedience to moral law, and yet they crucified Christ. But there are commandments, the rightness of which cannot be seen, except in the sovereignty of Him who commanded them. Indeed, it would be blasphemy to take one down into the water and say, "I baptize you in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit," if he had not commanded it. It would be sacrilege to take bread and wine and eat and drink them as the body and blood of Christ if he had not appointed it. In obedience to these things we show the world whose we are and whom we serve. They are tests of obedience and proofs of love to Him who commanded them.

See the binding import of positive law in the swift and severe penalties under the old dispensation. Our first parents fell, and we all fell with them "by the one offense"—the violation of a positive law—a law for which we see not the reason. Moses unintentionally changed a positive law, and so was not allowed to enter the promised land. Saul, from the best of motives, did not fully carry out a positive command, and received the just recompense of reward.

It was surely written for our sakes that "obedience is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." I Sam. 15. So Nadab and Abihu offering strange fire (Lev. 10). Also the men of Beth-shemesh, looking into the ark, and "the Lord slew fifty thousand, threescore and ten men." Also Uzza piously putting forth his hand to steady the ark, "and the Lord slew him for his presumption" (1 Chron. 13:9, 10). "Remember Lot's wife," should be written in a sentence of suns across the sky (Gen. 19:19-26). Why should she not look back? Was that a nonessential?

The Bible abounds with such examples, and Christ came not to lessen, but to increase the principle of obedience; yea, to "bring every thought in subjection to the obedience of him." Moral law may be obeyed in spirit, and not in letter; but not so in positive law, which is thought to be nonessential. Now, baptism is a positive precept. What if it is not obeyed? It is not vital, but essential. Then I ask the question, and I beg some one—yea, many—to answer it: What if this positive command is not obeyed? Let our editors also help to answer it.

See the CONCLUSION of this book for the further consideration of baptism as an Essential. Our feet and hands and eyes are essential, but not to life. Yet what are they worth to those who have life? Baptism may be worth more to our spiritual life than any or all of these are to physical life. As we pity the bird without wings, and the man without feet and hands and eyes, so we should pity the Christian who is without baptism.

## CHAPTER IV.

**W**ITHOUT following strictly the order first named, we will notice next the

### WHEN.

The Book says, "WHEN they believed they were baptized." "And many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized." If faith comes before repentance, and repentance before baptism, then it would read: "And When they repented they were baptized." Peter did join repentance and baptism in Acts 2: 38, but he used the *epi* before the dative: "Repent and be baptized, trusting upon the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." So faith after repentance and before baptism was in the idiom of the Greek, as scholars of all schools admit. If baptism should follow faith, then no room is left for repentance, as is confirmed by the practice of those who pervert the order of repentance and faith; for they never tell a believer to repent, nor do they expect or demand repentance between faith and baptism.

Many put the baptism When the subject is eight days old, or when it is expected to die, be it babe or adult. But the Scriptures know nothing of this. The Presbyterians endorse this, but make the When depend on at least one believing parent. A Presbyterian pastor was sent for at midnight to sprinkle the dying child of non-believing parents. He replied that he could not himself, but that he would bring in the Methodist pastor. It was a cold midnight service, and the latter tried to shame him out of his foolishness, but he was creed-bound and could not be persuaded or forced. As the child was several years old, the When was fixed at the dying hour, to which both would have agreed if the parents had been believers. But the Bible does not say: And when they were dying they were baptized. That came from Rome, the mother of Harlots. "And WHEN they believed they were baptized." That is the time When.

I would not baptize a dying person unless the motive was right. If one could not trust Jesus Christ for salvation by grace through faith, and was



afraid to die without baptism, I certainly would not administer it. Paul circumcised Timothy, and then wrote the Galatians that if they be circumcised Christ could profit them nothing. Why? Because they had been taught by false teachers that except they be circumcised they could not be saved, as one work would make it all of works. And so baptism, as a work, would make it all of works. Rom. 1:6.

## CHAPTER V.

**N**EXT to the Which, Whence, What, and When of baptism we will notice its

### WHERE.

This is not the order as first stated, but it is the more practical order. Of course if sprinkling and pouring are baptism, then the WHERE is of no consequence, as they can be performed almost anywhere where there is a thimbleful of water. But if immersion is baptism, then the place Where is of great importance. In John 1:28 we read of "WHERE John was baptizing." In John 10:40 we read that Jesus "went away again beyond Jordan into the place WHERE John at first baptized." And so of all the references to "in water," "in Jordan," "in the river," "in Enon because there was much water there." "There," is the answer to Where. Where did John baptize? There. Why there? Because there was much water there. It would be foolish to say that John sprinkled there because there was much water there. That could not be assigned as a reason for sprinkling, but for immersion it is all right. To the question, "Where shall we baptize?" the answer must furnish a place where there is "much water." This must be the reason, BECAUSE there is much water there."

But, says the caviler, the Greek is *polla hudata*, and means many waters, and refers to little springs with their little branches. The Greek is plural, but the expression, *polla hudata*, is never used to express the littleness of the waters, but their greatness. The expression is used in Rev. 1:15; "the sound of many waters" refers to the greatness of the sound. Little spring branches don't make much noise, if any. So in Rev. 17: means abundance, as interpreted in verse 15 to mean "over peoples and multitudes and nations and tongues." In Rev. 14:2 we have "the voice of many waters, even as the voice of great thunder." In Rev. 19:6 it is still stronger, "The voice of many waters, even as the voice of mighty thunderings." Little branches have no such thundering voices. In Psa. 93:4 it is "the voice of many waters, yea, the mighty waves of the sea." Those who have heard the noise of the mighty waves of the sea can't

testify to the noise of little spring branches. In Gen. 13:10, "Lot lifted up his eyes, and beheld all the plain of the Jordan, that it was well watered everywhere." While the cavilers cavil, let me have a word with my own brethren. I want to impress upon their hearts and consciences the importance of the PLACE WHERE. Brethren! I charge you in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you give more attention to the PLACE WHERE. Not in a hog wallow, or a filthy mud pond, or in ice water, but Where the ordinance can be administered decently and in order; and so obedience will not be grievous, but joyous. Let there be clean water, and temperate water. Don't befoul and torture the candidates, for "his commandments are not grievous, but joyous." Proper attention to the place Where would make the ordinance beautiful to behold, and a joy to obey. Do IT AT ANY COST.

## CHAPTER VI.

**L**ET us next consider the

**WHO**

of baptism. This refers to the administrator.

Like John, he should be a man "sent of God to baptize." God never sent but one unbaptized man to baptize, and he wanted to be baptized; but like other things there must be a beginning. All began life in infancy, except Adam and Eve. And so of all living creatures. The beginnings of all things are exceptions to the general rule. Necessarily an unbaptized man must begin the baptizing. When John said, "I have need to be baptized of thee," the answer was, "Suffer it to be so NOW," and that means it must not be suffered any more. He could have left off the "now," and said: "Suffer it to be so, for thus it becometh us," etc.; which would have made John's protest improper, and left the administration to all unbaptized men. Why should a man want to administer baptism if he had not received it?

If he thought he didn't need it, how can he think that others do? He makes himself a transgressor. So God never sent but one unbaptized man to baptize. If it is the duty of one disciple to be baptized, it is the duty of all. But how could God send a man to baptize who doesn't believe in it, but believes against it, and preaches and practices against it? This would make God an evil doer. The man who baptizes in the name of the Triune God, and then says that God never commanded it, is to my mind, in danger of the sin that hath no forgiveness. If God should send such a man to do such a thing, that would make him not only *particeps*, but author of the evil. God cannot count baptism to a man who received it from one who refused it, and who despises it. Others may think such baptisms good, but I can't. If you say the candidate is not responsible for the unknown disqualifications of the administrator, I answer, this disqualification is not unknown, but notoriously known. His membership with a denomination holding such a creed is sufficient disqualification, though he may be an exception to the rule. If he received baptism rightly, and from

the proper authority, and still believes in it, yet his membership with the contrary party disqualifies him, because by it he makes himself a transgressor, and a hypocrite. "Come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and I will receive you." What can God think of one who doesn't believe in baby sprinkling, and yet gives his membership and support to such a doctrine? Joined to something and supporting something you don't believe in! What would you think of me if I should solemnly sprinkle a baby in the name of the Triune God, believing about it as you know I do? And yet that would be just like the other. Could God send a man to act the hypocrite? "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." John wanted to be baptized; he believed in it, just as he practiced it, and Christ could have baptized him either before or after his own baptism, but he chose not to do it. Christ did what God sent him to do, but he didn't baptize, and that shows that God didn't send him to baptize, and Christ did not send Paul to baptize (I Cor. 1:17). He came to save men, and sent Paul to save men, but not to baptize them, and that shows that baptism is not a saving ordinance, for as it did not save him, so it saved no one else. If baptism were a saving ordinance, then there would have been no restrictions on the administrator. Everybody should by all means try to save all; and if baptism were a means of salvation, I would be in favor of all baptizing and of baptizing all.

Now let us come nearer to the subject. Are baptizers sent of God Now? Yes. How? He gave all authority in heaven and earth to his Son, after he finished his work on earth, and the Son organized his disciples into CHURCHES, and gave them—the churches—the keys (Matt. 18:18), with all instructions and responsibilities to keep all things he commanded as delivered to them. He put the ordinances and the officers in the church, and the church is charged to choose proper ones to fill the offices, and administer the ordinances. So that, when the church recognizes in one the internal call of God to a work, she ratifies it by encouraging in him or ordaining him to that work. If Christ left these matters to the custodian care of his churches, then he left them to no one else, and no one else has authority from him to proceed. He did not leave these matters to a pope, for there was no pope in those days. He did not leave them to a conference of bishops, self-styled and self-appointed, and perverted, for

there were none such in those days. He did not leave them to an assembly of ruling elders, for there were none till Calvin's day, as Presbyterians acknowledge. But he did leave them to the churches of God, scattered abroad—one in Jerusalem, one at Corinth, one at Rome, etc. This institution Christ built, and told it to multiply, and to guard safely all things whatsoever, and that he would be with them (as churches) to the consummation of the ages and that the gates of Hades should not prevail against these churches. Christ, acting for his church, gave special commissions for special occasions, as in the case of Philip and the Eunuch; but when churches were established, he left the matter with them, as he first purposed and promised. It is safe and orderly to follow this rule, but to tear away from baptism, church membership, church supervision, and all else, is anarchy of the most dangerous kind. It would plunge everything into disorder and chaos, and every man would become a law unto himself for a while, and then he would become lawless.

The WHO of baptism is the point of present attack. Some of our theological seminaries seem to grow in antagonism to any particular Who. They seem to favor unrestricted administratorship; for if one departure can be made, any can. Be sure to get Dayton's "Alien Immersion," and the "Porter-Brown Debate." You must arm yourselves for this coming conflict. These books give both sides of the argument.

As the commission was given to the church, all the members should make disciples, and as baptism was also given "with the all things whatsoever" to the church, then the church is responsible for the safe-keeping of baptism. As Christ baptized through those he appointed, so the church baptizes through those she appoints. A Baptist is not one who believes in baptism, or who has received it, but one who administers it. A baptized man who is not a church member can't be a Baptist, because he can't have anything to do in baptizing. The church member who votes, as his expression of consent to, and approbation of, a baptism, is as much the administrator as Christ was, when he baptized through his appointees. The administrator is the servant of the church in such matters, and can only proceed as the church directs. If a preacher can't put a man into a church without the expressed consent of the church, neither can he

baptize without the expressed consent of the church—especially if he considers the individual as baptized "into the church," as revival reports generally state it. The door into the church is for ingress and egress, and as no one is baptized out of the church, so no one is baptized into the church. The uplifted hand of consent, or dissent, lets him in or puts him out, but the uplifted hand can't let an unbaptized man in, because no such prerogative is given. Hence, if a church must guard her own membership, she must be the judge of all the qualifications for membership, of which baptism is one. She must also judge of the other qualifications, such as repentance and faith, and to this end she must have both the profession and the fruits. This makes church sanction necessary to the administratorship of baptism. To the church were "committed the ordinances for to keep," as "once for all delivered," and as Paul made the church at Corinth blameworthy for the abuse of the supper, so would she be blamable for the wrong use or abuse of baptism. If one is a church ordinance, so is the other. So, to the question of the WHO in baptism, the answer is, the church, through her appointees. If that Baptist preacher, Elder Luce, had not been so loose, he would not have taken baptism from the church and given it to Alexander Campbell, "in order to the remission of his sins," on his own authority. See what a world of trouble this one sin, and this one sinner, brought upon the churches of Jesus Christ. If Campbell had gone to a Baptist church and said that, as a sinner, he wanted to be baptized in order to be saved, I doubt if a church on earth would have received him. Luce thought he had a big and liberal heart, but it was his head that was affected with bigness, and his liberality was liberty with the doctrines of Christ.

### **CAMPBELLITE IMMERSIONS.**

This is a good place for a few reasons for Baptist churches refusing to accept such immersions. A generation ago, the question of alien baptism was well discussed, but the rising generation did not get the benefit of it. Many are anxious to know why we cannot receive Campbellite immersions, since they, as well as Baptists, require a "penitent believer." That pedobaptists who refuse and abuse immersion should not be counted as Scriptural administrators of the ordinance, is easy for them to understand.

I desire to get the matter satisfactorily before the minds of our young people who are soon to have the responsibility of keeping the ordinances as delivered to the churches.

The controversy is mainly on the relation and order of salvation to baptism. Does salvation come before baptism, or baptism before salvation? The differences in the conditions of saint and sinner, of justification and condemnation, express the issue on the character of the subject to be baptized. If baptism is for the saint, it is not for the sinner; if for the saved, it is not for the lost; if for the justified, it is not for the "already condemned." From this statement of the question we easily come to the design of baptism. They baptize sinners to make them saints; the lost that they may be saved; the condemned that they may be justified; the unforgiven, that their sins may be really remitted or really washed away. We both claim that right subjects are necessary, but we are the poles apart on the rightness of the subjects, hence on the design of the ordinance.

If one of these positions is right or Scriptural, the other is not. If the ordinance with either of these opposite meanings is valid, then the ordinance has no meaning. With this world wide difference in mind, let us examine the issue involved, interpreting the few Scriptures of apparent ambiguity, in the plain light of the many others on the subject. We differ from them on the relation of baptism to salvation, and they with us on the relation of faith to salvation, so the difference is clear and wide, and deep as wide.

When they deny the Romish doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and claim that they hold faith and repentance as prerequisites to baptism, and that we should therefore accept their baptism as valid, they are unconscious of begging the question on several points vital to the ordinance. The difference in the professed characters of their "penitent believers," and our believing penitents, requires—the difference in design—one to procure in baptism what the other procured by faith. Crediting both with what is professed, which is proper, we find that what one professed to have received, the other professed to have not received.



They also beg the question on the administratorship of baptism.

As to the first point of difference: if their faith and repentance are not equivalent to our repentance and faith, or if the same fruits and results claimed by us are disclaimed by them, then in our judgment their candidate for baptism does not possess the qualification we professed and require, and hence we cannot receive their baptism as valid.

To misplace baptism in the gospel system is to displace it from the gospel system. Baptism before, and hence without repentance and faith, is a perversion of the gospel system. And so of the order of repentance and faith. If the believer, according to their system, must repent or perish, then he is not a believer, for "whosoever believes shall not perish."

If one party claims that his candidate is a believer, and therefore saved, and the other that his candidate is a believer, but not saved, then the difference in the two candidates is that of the saved and lost, and such difference of characters in the subjects for baptism cannot be ignored. They claim that their faith results in conviction of sin, while our faith results in the peaceable fruits of righteousness. In vain do we seek for a charity that can cover this discrepancy. The Scriptural fruits of saving faith are experienced by our candidates, and not experienced by theirs, hence their peculiar definitions of faith and repentance, as well as their peculiar order, or rather disorder, as required by Mr. Campbell's system of error.

The woman of whom Christ said: "She loved much because she had been forgiven much;" and to whom he said: "Thy faith hath saved thee, go in peace," was a proper subject for baptism. If she had not been baptized, then salvation was predicated of her pre-baptism faith, and her pre-baptism love evidenced her forgiveness. If she had been baptized, then Christ overlooked her baptism, and predicated her salvation of a faith that was not expressed or perfected in baptism, and proved her forgiveness by a love that expressed itself in other ways than baptism.

When Christ said: "He that believeth not is condemned, but he that

believeth is not condemned," he was talking about the faith necessary to baptism, for he was addressing an unbaptized man. When he said: "He that believeth on the Son bath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life," he was talking of the faith that is prerequisite to baptism, for he was talking to unbelievers. When Peter said: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him should receive remission of sins," he was addressing unbaptized Gentiles, who, hearing this, believed; and God who knows the heart, bore them witness, giving them the Holy Spirit as he did to the apostles, and put no difference between them, purifying their hearts by faith. And when they spoke with tongues and magnified God, then answered Peter: "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Spirit as well as we?"

Christ had made a promise about those that believe receiving the Holy Spirit, and Peter remembering these words of the Lord Jesus, said to the church at Jerusalem, before which he was arraigned for the disorder (?): "Inasmuch as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us who believe on the Lord Jesus, what was I that I could withstand God?" When Paul spoke of "the righteousness of God by faith in Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all that believe," he was referring to a righteousness by faith as witnessed by the law and the prophets. This faith was expressly without law and without works, and evidently without baptism. Hence we conclude that the candidate for baptism must possess a faith that secures salvation, everlasting life, remission of sin, the Holy Spirit, and justification.

Now, since their candidates for baptism profess a faith that confessedly does not save the soul, or secure remission, the Holy Spirit, and justification, but rush on to baptism to have these mighty defects in their faith supplied, saying that "baptism doth now (really) save us," and (really) washes away sins, and is (really) for, or in order to the remission of sins; then said candidates, from our point of view, have not the faith of the gospel, but are still under condemnation and in the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity; hence cannot be recognized by us as proper subjects, and hence the immersion is null and void as a Scriptural baptism.

We will proceed now to a further, full and fair examination of this unscriptural candidate for an unscriptural baptism, with an unscriptural design, and by an unscriptural administrator, of an unscriptural church.

Let us apply the Scripture texts further to their candidates for baptism. "Whosoever believes on the Son of God is not condemned," "shall not perish," but "has everlasting life," and "shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." Now "whosoever" takes in all of those classes, and if such a candidate says he believes in the Son of God, but is yet in his sins, and under condemnation; that he has not passed from death unto life, then his faith must have its defects measured by the value of these fruits. Hence the infinite value of the fruits mark the infinite defects of his faith, and faith infinitely defective falls infinitely short of what is essential to valid baptism.

Again "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself." Now, if said candidate professes the faith, but disclaims the witness within, the earnest of the Spirit in his heart; if he says he did not "receive the Holy Spirit when he believed," but that he is still in the flesh and not in the Spirit, because the Spirit does not dwell in him (Rom. 8:9); if his instructors and administrator unite with him in these admissions and the admissions still further accord with their adopted creed, then it is not unrighteous to judge him out of his own mouth, and out of the mouths of his chosen witnesses and by his chosen creed, and in doing so we are bound from our standpoint to declare his immersion an utterly invalid baptism. To credit one with what he and his insist that he has not received, is a charity that rejoices not with the truth, but with soul-destroying error. Those who possess this barrenness of faith vainly seek those fruits in baptism, and as baptism was never designed by its author to confer them, the baptism is likewise barren, hence the logical and theological necessity of their denying the blessed experience of grace in the soul.

Again, a proper subject of baptism must "believe that Jesus is the Christ" in such a way as to evidence his new birth, for all such, says John, are born or begotten of God. This in Greek is neither Subjunctive nor

Optative, but Indicative; not Active, but Passive; not Imperfect, but Perfect—has been born of God. "Whosoever is born of God sinneth not;" "cannot sin because born of God;" "he overcomes the world and that wicked one touches him not." Now, those who claim that baptism is in order to the new birth, deny these fruits of faith to those who believe that Jesus is the Christ, and they confess that these Scripture texts and tests were not fulfilled in their candidate's faith, and we deny that baptism secures them, hence we cannot consistently recognize their baptism as valid because of their invalid faith.

If they can say of their believers: "Except they repent they will perish," and if we can say of our believers, "They shall never perish," then such a defect is again discovered as to make recognition of their repentance, faith or baptism impracticable. If their faith, as is claimed, produces conviction of sin, then it was not the faith Christ taught, for he said, "The world would he convicted of sin because they believed not." Instead of conviction of sin, peace, love, and joy in the Holy Ghost are the fruits of faith in Christ. Does not such a perversion of the gospel destroy conviction, repentance, and faith, as well as the baptism? I never heard of one under their preaching being pierced to the heart and crying out, as on Pentecost. Nor of falling down trembling like the jailer; nor that conviction described in I Cor. 14:25; nor that of Paul described in Rom. 7:7-13, and exemplified in Acts 9:9-11, etc.

When one of their hearers says to his preacher: "Sir, while you were speaking I believed, and I, want to be baptized straightway, 'the same hour,' and not a word of demand or command or even exhortation for this believer (?) to repent before he is baptized, and with no enquiry for the fruits of repentance at baptism, then where does the repentance come in? It must, they say, come after faith and before baptism, which they further say ought to be "straightway," even "the same hour," so I see no place for repentance, though you seek it carefully with tears. Now if it is wrong to administer baptism without some evidence of repentance, then it is just as wrong to receive such, since that is an endorsement of it.

Another prerequisite to baptism is such a confession of Christ as can be

made in the Holy Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:2); and in all such cases it may be said: "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him and he in God." "Whosoever shall confess with the mouth the Lord Jesus, and shall believe in his heart that God hath raised him from the dead, shall be saved." "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father and before the angels." Now, if their candidate for baptism confess the Lord Jesus with the mouth, but avows that God does not dwell in him and he in God; if he replies to the next Scripture that he is not "saved" and will not be "confessed before the Father and his angels" unless he is baptized, and many have thus confessed and never been baptized; if such an appreciation of baptism and depreciation of confession, with faith and repentance thrown in, are matters of indifference with Baptists, then further contention for a proper subject and design of baptism is useless. Have not these loose views and practices already brought indifference as to the prerequisites of baptism, and has not this wrought present spiritual desolation to our Zion? Fatness indeed as to quantity, but leanness as to quality; and instead of the church in the world, have we not the world in the church? If Christ is for salvation to the ends of the earth and to the end of time, then baptism is not. The question is, When and where and how do we appropriate and become conscious of the salvation that is in Christ? All true believers say at faith, and so say the Scriptures, but "those of the contrary part" failing to realize the salvation in baptism, must deny the consciousness of it to any one anywhere. Does not this perversion of the design of baptism turn the sinner from the Saviour to a sacrament, and from the death of Christ to a likeness of it?

But love is also a prerequisite to baptism, and it is the greatest of them all. But "every one that loveth is (has been) born of God." "He that loveth him that begat, loveth them also that are begotten of him." "We know we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren." Now, if it be confessed that these fruits of love are not found in certain candidates for baptism; that they are not born of God; that they have not passed from death unto life; if these fruits of love are credited to baptism, then is not the greatest of these baptism? When a physical act, performed upon the physical part of man by putting him in literal water "to be seen of

men," is claimed to accomplish more for the soul than love to God and love to man; if without baptism love and all its prerequisites can do nothing; if a willing God and a loving Saviour and a wooing Spirit and an anxious, penitent, praying, believing, loving, confessing candidate can do nothing without some kind or any kind of an administrator of baptism; if all these prerequisites are so minified and baptism so magnified as to become the all and in all, and so designed to obtain all, then "why tarry, arise and be baptized and (really) wash away your sins" might be substituted for all the exhortations to repent, etc. Such a perversion of the design of baptism is a perversion of the plan of salvation, and we cannot endorse it without becoming a partaker of the evil. There are other weighty reasons why we cannot receive such immersions for baptism, but this must suffice for this place.

This is a good place for me to give my reasons for the rejection also of immersions from our anti-Missionary Baptists. We regard them as a scism, and so they regard us; and neither party can receive the baptisms of the other without a surrender of church authority in the matter. If each regards the other as a scism, then each is bound to rebaptism unless a scism is a church. See Rom. 16:17. The whole question of church responsibility is surrendered when such baptisms are received. If I were to join them, I would want to be baptized into their church fellowship, and into the WHAT of their baptism. The WHAT is unto a doctrine that broke church fellowship and necessitated the division. When one of them comes to us he leaves that church and the WHAT of their baptism for ours, and he ought to demand baptism at our hands.

A church or preacher that does not believe in "discipling all nations" and "preaching the gospel to every creature," has no commission to baptize, as baptism was given to a missionary church. If Acts 2:42 refers to the Lord's Supper, then it was observed by a missionary Baptist church and no others observed it in those days.

Anti-missionism or omissionism should invalidate any and all church claims, and such have no authority to baptize, as sinners must be converted in order to baptism. If one believes in converting sinners, but not

in baptizing them, he is one-sided; but he who believes in baptizing, but not in converting, is no-sided, as baptism without conversion is nothing. If he will not begin at the beginning, then he should not begin at all.

## CHAPTER VII.

**L**ET us now enquire into the

### WHOM

of baptism. WHOM should the WHO baptize? Some say infants are the ones to be baptized. So they call themselves Pedo, or infant, baptizers — that is, sent to sprinkle babies. Others say, not all infants, but only such as have one or more believing parent. I believe they claim that the eighth day is the proper time. Perhaps all of these think that the dying ones at any age are included in the Whom. Others who reject infant sprinkling claim that adult sinners who desire to be saved, constitute the Whom of baptism. They don't state it that way in so many words, but rather the "penitent believer;" yet such a "penitent believer" must yet be in his sins. By putting faith before repentance, they have what they call "penitent believers," and of course a believer that is not saved ought to repent, and especially of his non-saving faith. Of course a penitent believer is yet in his sins, but not so of a believing penitent. If a man repents toward God and believes in Jesus Christ, he has no sins to wash away, except symbolically to declare that the blood of Christ had cleansed him from all sin. So the answer is quickly reached: The believing penitent is the WHOM of baptism. As there can be no faith unto salvation without repentance, the expression is superfluous, and ought to be simply THE BELIEVER. "When they believed they were baptized." Acts 8:12. "And many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized." Acts 18:8. As "whosoever believeth hath everlasting life," and as they must believe before they are baptized, then they must have everlasting life before they are baptized. So, as no unsaved man is a proper subject of baptism, then the baptism (?) of such is a nullity. Then if none such are baptized, none such are saved, judging them out of their own mouth. If we can't think they are baptized, they can't ask us to think they are saved. We might think that some of them are saved despite their error, but it would not be



courteous to conclude thus, contrary to their premise. If we are forced to deny their premise, and they are forced to deny our conclusions, we had better quit trying to force each other and just simply be "separate" and "avoid one another" in religious matters. We can't walk together with such a disagreement. For peace's sake and truth's sake let us not try to walk together across a chasm wide as eternal life and deep as eternal death.

It is nowhere said that when they repented they were baptized. In those scriptures that connect repentance and baptism there is an idiomatic expression of the relation, that compels faith to come between, as in Acts 2: 38. Neither penitents nor infants belong to the Whom of Baptism.

As to the latter, see further on.

## CHAPTER VIII.

**N**OW, if the WHOM of baptism is a saved person, then we come at once to the

### WHY

of baptism. "WHY baptizeth thou?" was the question John had to answer. John 1:25. For what purpose is this ordinance? If not to save people, then WHY baptize? The same question might be asked of joining the church, eating the supper, praying, preaching, giving, eating, sleeping, marrying, etc. Of course if one thinks that salvation is of works, then it must be all of works, and that must mean that all works are for salvation. I have heard from the pulpit that salvation was affected by all we do, hence the preacher said, All he did was for his salvation; that he had to work it out, and it would take all of his life to do it, and he did it with fear and trembling lest he might fail. If that is the way of salvation, then there is no hope for any one. Never was there ignorance so dense and dark and deep and damnable. Such an error as that must be attained unto by long training, and generally inheritance thrown in. With an open Bible it is inexcusable. As for me, I do nothing to be saved, and would not for my right arm, and eye, and foot, thrown in. I was not baptized to be saved. I did not join the church to be saved, nor eat the supper, nor serve as Sunday school superintendent, or deacon, or now in the ministry, with my new work thrown in. You may say that I preach and pray for the money there is in it, or that I would betray my Lord and religion for a trifle, or that I would sell my soul for naught, but don't accuse me, as the devil did Job, of practicing godliness for gain. Charity does not demand that I should credit such a man with regeneration, but charity demands that I should deny it, and that to his face, for regeneration changes the motive of service. I don't want a religion that could not lift me on a higher plane. On the Design of Baptism, or the WHY of baptism, I have pretty fully delivered myself in the Nashville Debate, covering with my opponent 407 pages. Also in Baptist Why and Why Not. If it be claimed that John baptized for the remission of sins, and Peter told the Pentecostians to be

baptized for the remission of sins, and that the "for" answers the question of our Why, the replies and protests come thick and fast and loud. Neither John nor Peter said it. If "for" is the right translation of *eis* after baptized, then John baptized for repentance, for it is the same preposition, the same preceding verb, and the same succeeding accusative case; and as prepositions are affected by the preceding verbs, and the following cases, and their purpose is to show relation, then the relation must be the same, where these do not change, and the translation of the prepositions should be uniform in such cases. Then we would have in Matt. 3:11: I indeed baptize you in water "for" repentance. Mark 1:4: John preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. Same in Luke 3:3; Matt. 28:19: Baptizing them "for" the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Acts 8:16: Baptized "for" the name of the Lord Jesus.

Acts 19:3: "For" what were ye baptized? And they said, "For" John's baptism. Verse 5: Baptized "for" the name of the Lord Jesus. Rom. 6:3: Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized "for" the Lord Jesus, were baptized "for" his death. Therefore we were buried with him by baptism "for" death. I Cor. 1:13: Were ye baptized "for" the name of Paul? Verse 15: Lest any one should say that I baptized "for" my own name. I Cor. 12:13: For in spirit we were all baptized "for" one body. I Cor. 10:2: And were all baptized "for" Moses. Gal. 3:27: For as many of you as have been baptized "for" Jesus Christ. There are eighteen places where we have baptize *eis*. King James translates the *eis* "for," in three places; "unto," in four places; "in," in six places; "to," in five places. If they could have confused it more, I suppose they would have done so, as they give about forty-seven different translations to this one preposition. So, to grant this WHY we baptized, we must confess that "for" is the right translation of *eis* after baptize, and that "in order to" is the right meaning of "for," and neither of these could we consent unto for one moment with the facts before us. All the facts and all truths are against both. In the above, the Oxford Revision translates "into," in twelve places; "unto," in five; and "in," in one; "for," in none. Broadus, and Meyer, and others of the best scholars say "unto" is right in all places after baptize, and they define "unto" in the sense of "with respect to," and this fits every case. As John baptized with reference to a preceding repentance, and that as a *sine qua non*, so he baptized with reference, or with respect to a preced-

ing remission of sins as a *sine qua non*. So, also, we are to be baptized unto, or with reference to, a preceding death, which we died unto sin. If to bury a body into death, or in order to death, would be counted as murder, what shall we call the other burial into death which the baptism visibly shows forth? The preceding death is the *sine qua non* of burial in both cases.

But if the Why be changed to for, in its true sense, and you ask what do we baptize for? the answer is, Because Christ set us the example, and told us to follow in his steps. Also, because Christ commanded it, to show his and our death and resurrection; or, because he and we died indeed once unto sin, and arose to walk in newness of life; or, because he ordained it as the profession of our faith; or, because we want to be clothed in the new uniform of allegiance; or, because our good conscience wants to make a response or answer to the cleansing of the sprinkled blood; or, because we are his, and his forever, and we want everybody to know it; because we have been regenerated by God's sovereign Spirit—have been saved by grace through faith, forgiven through his mercy, and justified by his blood; or, because having become new creatures in Christ Jesus, and having been created unto good works, and God having foreordained that we should walk therein; and because he works in us both to will and to do his good pleasure; and because the love of Christ constrains us; and because we rejoice in hope of the glory of God—because of these and other unspeakable experiences of grace in our hearts and souls and lives, therefore it is our joy to make all men see our fellowship for him and his by the "figure" or "likeness" which he appointed, and which so beautifully and forcefully answers all of these requirements. As we die but once, and are saved but once, and are to be baptized but once, let us, like Zacharias and Elisabeth, show that we are righteous before God by walking in all his commandments and ordinances blameless—not blamelessly, qualifying the walk, but blameless, qualifying the regenerated character and motive leading to the walk.

To assume that "in order to" is the meaning of *eis*, or "for," is to presume against facts and truths, and to assume the unprovable. This *eis*

occurs some 1,700 times in the New Scriptures, and while the King James translates it forty-seven different ways, they never translate it "in order to," although the translators believed in baptismal remission, and often forced the doctrine in, yet they dared not do it by translating *eis* in order to. Neither does the Canterbury, nor Sharpe, nor Sawyer, nor Wesley, and many others. Doddridge did it once, Bible Union twice, A. Campbell four times, Emphatic Diaglott five times, and Anderson, the great translator of the Bethany School, had the courage, or rather the daring, to translate *eis* twenty times "in order to." The first runs thus: "I indeed baptize you in order to repentance," and then, of course, in order to remission of sins. Well, if one is right, the other is; and if one is wrong, the other is. Now sum up the ten translations and we have this preposition translated 17,000 times, and altogether have thirty-two times "in order to," and 16,968 against it. Now rule out the three that are given to the doctrine, and we have left three against 16,997, in the argument on translation. The argument on lexicons is also very lame. But if I should grant for argument's sake that "in order to" is the right translation after baptize, then the question as to whether it would be in order to obtain, or in order to declare, would still leave all the proof on my side. (See Nashville Debate on this.) But to settle the matter, substitute "in order to" in all the eighteen cases of baptize *eis*, and then, if you do not give it up—good-bye; you are joined to your idol. But for a heaping good measure I will add this argument on "into:"

### **BAPTIZE EIS REMISSION.**

(Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3; Acts 2:38.)

Baptize is the visible act of putting the physical part of man into literal water and raising him up again. This latter act of raising up again is not in the word baptize, but in the ordinance as supplemented and delivered unto us. The fact that spiritual lessons are symbolized and typified by the ordinance does not militate against the fact that baptize is purely a physical act, "to be seen of men." The failure to impress the beholders with the spiritual lessons it was appointed to suggest, does not invalidate the ordinance. Since the qualifications of the two parties engaged are to be possessed and determined before baptism, it follows that the

prerequisites and spiritual lessons are both clearly differentiated from the visible act of putting the physical man into literal water. In the expression, "Baptize *eis* remission," we have a physical act with respect to a spiritual state, and it is not possible to enter that spiritual state by that physical act. The means are not adapted to the end. In the expression, "Go *eis* the house," we have a physical action with regard to a physical object, and by the physical action the physical object may be entered. The mean is adapted to the end. But in the expression, "Go *eis* debt," debt not being a physical object, the verb go is used in a metaphorical sense, and not, as in the other, in the sense of walk, for we do not walk into debt with our feet. Hence; baptize into remission is an absurdity; for if that kind of state could be entered by that kind of action, the entrance would depend wholly upon the action, and the action would become infallible.

And note: there is no promise of remission to the penitent believer on condition that he be baptized. This promise is made to the believer: "Whosoever believeth shall receive remission of sins." Acts 10:43.

In Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3, and Acts 2:38, we have not a promise of remission given on account of baptism, but we have a physical act to be performed with respect to remission of sins. In Acts 10:43 we have remission promised to the believer, but in the other three passages we are not told what God will do for us in baptism, but what we ourselves do in baptism, with respect to remission of sins. If it be claimed in opposition to this that the expressions, believe *eis* salvation, *eis* Christ, and *eis* eternal life, and repent *eis* salvation, etc., are equivalent to a promise of these blessings, like that contained in Acts 10: 43, the reply is, that believe *eis* remission does not occur, neither does a promise of remission to the baptized occur. Besides, in the expressions, repent *eis* salvation and believe *eis* salvation, we have means suited to the end—i. e., spiritual exercises connected with spiritual blessings; and it does no violence to sanctified common sense to conceive that by those spiritual exercises we enter those spiritual states. But the expressions, baptize *eis* repentance and baptize *eis* remission, are clear or cloudy, according to the standpoint from which we view them. A man must first imbibe the error of baptismal remission, or he would never force such an unnatural interpretation of the words, baptize *eis* remission, into a support of that doctrine.

We have a forcible illustration of this in Prof. McGarvey's comment on Matt. 3:11: Baptize *e/s* repentance. When commenting on that expression he writes like a Baptist; but on baptize *e/s* remission he seems to lose his Baptist head and heart, and labors by a sort of natural translation to give an unnatural interpretation. I propose now to apply his interpretation of baptize *e/s* repentance, to the similar expression, baptize *e/s* remission. The fact that repentance was required before baptism led the scholarly professor to interpret the words according to the fact. But the fact that faith is required before baptism is more abundantly taught than the other; and the other fact, that remission, justification, sanctification, salvation, and eternal life are so often affirmed of "all who believe," should have led the professor to give the same interpretation to baptize *e/s* remission. The fact that believe *e/s* Christ occurs forty-seven times, and baptize *e/s* Christ occurs only twice, should lead us to stress the former more than the latter, because the Scriptures do. They are both correct. We really believe *e/s* Christ, and are formally or professionally baptized *e/s* Christ.

But here is the Professor's note of comment: "I baptize you unto repentance, implies that the baptism brought them to repentance. But such is not the fact in the case, for repentance was required as a prerequisite to baptism, and it is rather true that repentance brought them to baptism."

Now, that is the way to interpret Scripture. As both expressions are alike, let us quote the Professor again, only substitute remission for repentance. Then it would read: "I baptize you unto remission, implies that the baptism brought them to remission. But such is not the fact in the case, for remission was required as a prerequisite to baptism (Acts 10:43), and it is rather true that remission brought them to baptism." That would have been consistent reasoning.

Now see the Professor contradict himself again. On the same passage, Matt. 3:11, he says: "To assume, as some have done, that the preposition has the sense of 'because of,' is to seek to escape by attaching a meaning to a word which it never has. The preposition *e/s* is never used to express the idea that one thing is done because of another thing having been done." Now turn over to Matt. 10:41, 42, and we have: Receive a prophet

*eis* the name of a prophet, and a righteous man *eis* the name of a righteous man. On this the Professor says: "In the name of a prophet is a Hebraism for 'because he is a prophet.' (Alford.) He who receives a prophet because he is a prophet, or a righteous man because he is a righteous man, or who gives a drink of water to a disciple because he is a disciple, distinctively recognizes the person's relation to God as the ground of the act."

"Living Oracles," translated by Drs. Mac-Knight, George Campbell, and Philip Doddridge, and edited by Alexander Campbell, has "because" as the translation of *eis* in the three places in Matt. 10:41, 42. So has Anderson's translation, and also Emphatic Diaglott. Timothy Dwight, in the Sunday School Times, when that was in the lesson, remarked: "In the name of; or, as the original expression literally means, into the name of—that is, with reference to, and thus because of, the fact that the messenger coming is a prophet or a righteous man."

Alexander Maclaren, in the same paper, said on the same verses: "To receive a prophet in the name of a prophet means to welcome him because he is such; or, in other words, it expresses recognition and sympathy. So in each of the other clauses."

And so the legs of the lame are not equal. Many a man has slipped on that *eis* and crippled himself and the cause. Some Baptists also.

Add to this such expressions as repent *eis* the preaching of Jonah, where *eis* certainly respects something going before as the cause or occasion; and also the fact that faith, in Acts 2:38, came before baptism, and that the same Peter to the Gentiles preached the old, old doctrine of remission to "whosoever believeth," and remission in Acts 2:38 sets in before baptism as easily as repentance in Matt. 3:11.

If Cornelius in Acts 10:43 obtained remission of sins by faith, as all the prophets testify, then his remission was before baptism, as the record clearly shows. Are we saved by faith or by water? Really by faith and figuratively by water.



"The like figure whereunto baptism cloth now save us."

I am not arguing that baptism is because of the remission of sins any more than because of repentance, faith, salvation, justification, etc., all of which precede; but to show the absurdity of some who avow that *eis* never looks backward. It certainly looks backward in the above and many other cases, and therefore it may look backward at remission of sins—yea, it must. Sickness may occasion death, but we don't die because we are sick. Jonah's preaching was a cause of repentance, but they did not repent because he preached, but because they were struck with fear, as a result of the preaching. One thing may occasion another, and yet not be the cause of it. Courtship may occasion the wedding, but the cause of the marriage is to be found in love rather than the courtship. Different words indicate different ideas.

If the "much water" was the cause of John's Baptism in Enon, then he should have baptized every time he found "much water."

Water, much or little, don't cause baptism. The much water was the cause of the place being chosen, but the baptism had causes of a spiritual character.

## CHAPTER IX.

### THE WAY TO BAPTISM.

**P**RACTICALLY this is the most important part of the subject. Doctrinally, as discussed in the "What and Whence of Baptism," there are greater things; and the subject and design discussed under the "Whom and Why" are of great importance. But in this we go back of the identification of the subject, "The Believer," to consider the way along which divine grace led him in his preparation for so solemn a profession. The eunuch put it just right when he asked Philip, "WHAT DOTH HINDER ME TO BE BAPTIZED?" Nothing should hinder any one from hearing, repenting, believing, praying, etc.; but baptism is not for every one, and just so sure as it is not the duty of every one to be baptized, so sure ought we to know what the hindrances are. The way to baptism is by the way to salvation, as salvation must come first. "Blood before water and Christ before the church." The cross is on one side of the river, and the church on the other. John hindered multitudes from being baptized. See Matt. 3:7-11 and Luke 3:6-9. When Ananias said to Saul, "Why tarriest thou?" he did not mean that none should tarry, or that it is wrong to tarry. There had been a proper tarrying, but there ought to be an end even of proper tarrying. Saul having spent three days and nights in fasting and prayer, and having made a complete surrender of his heart and life, and all, to him who revealed himself to him, and whom the Father had revealed in him; having received his commission as a chosen vessel to bear his name to Gentiles and kings; and Ananias having been informed that the lion was now a lamb, and that the persecutor now prays, and Saul having received his sight, and having been filled with the Holy Spirit, Ananias said, "Brother Saul, why tarriest thou?" Not, why did you tarry? Not, why did you tarry so long? but, why tarry any longer? There ought to be a proper tarrying, but there ought to be an end even of proper tarrying. Why tarriest THOU any longer? Having been accepted by the beloved, and in the beloved; and being justified by faith; having been washed in the blood of the Lamb; now show this salvation in the "figure" of baptism, the appointed "likeness" of what has come to you, even as the leper who had been healed was required to offer the appointed ceremony for his healing. Let this great inward work be outwardly manifested by

your professed subjection to this appointed way.

WHAT DOTTH HINDER ME TO BE BAPTIZED? ought to be the question of the age. To the unconvicted sinner it is of superlative importance lest some of the nine-tenths of the professing Christian world should rush him to a sort of miscalled baptism that has no hindrance, no tarrying, and hence no preparation. They think, and will try to make the sinner think, that their so-called baptism is all he needs. To the convicted and enquiring sinner who may ask, "What lack I yet?" the question is of vital importance, as the same set would be eager to pilot him adroitly around repentance and prayer and faith to the saving efficacy of their water, be that much or little.

To the candidate who has tarried, and sought full preparation, the question is still of great importance, since all should walk cautiously, and holily, and blameless in all heaven-appointed ordinances, lest they "run upon the thick bosses of his buckler," as some did in olden time to their own undoing and utter ruin (Job 15:26); and like "the multitudes" tried to do, but John forbade them. Luke 3:7.

To all Church Members it is of no less importance, as they should examine and prove themselves while there is time and opportunity to correct mistakes, and, if necessary, to "do the first works," where there has been deception. And to the churches of Jesus Christ the question loses none of its importance, as the right keeping of the ordinances has been committed to their solemn trust, to keep as first delivered. The question should engage also the especial attention of the Catholic World—Greek and Roman—since they have changed the ordinances, and corrupted the way of truth in all the earth. They have deceived the nations of the earth to their everlasting ruin by removing all hindrances from the ordinances, and by putting first what they call baptism. To the Protestant World it should be of equal interest, since through greed of gain they, too, have made merchandise of souls, by aping the old Mother of Harlots in their non-restriction of baptism. Also to those who believe in regeneration, remission, and salvation by Immersion, the subject is equally important,

as they have given their strength for nearly a century in ridiculing the essential and vital prerequisites to baptism, and have rushed a million of immortals from an intellectual faith in a historical fact, into immersion, leaving no place for repentance that can be found, though you seek it carefully with tears. By putting intellectual faith first and baptism the "same hour," they never tell their believers that they must repent, nor do they demand the fruits of repentance when the time of immersion comes.

Now let us enquire after the Bible Hindrances to Baptism. I will divide them into two classes:

First, the

### **POSITIVE HINDRANCES,**

which are those that should hinder all alike. Second, the

### **POSSIBLE HINDRANCES,**

or those that might lie in the way of some and not others.

The lack of anything which the Scriptures plainly put in the Way to Baptism, should be considered a Hindrance to Baptism. Then, first, in a general way, THE WANT OF PROPER TEACHING should be a Hindrance to Baptism. The commission does not begin with baptize, but Teach. It occurs twice in the commission, and the first includes more than the second. Its importance is seen further in Luke 3:18; Acts 2:40; 8:35; 10:37; 16:13, 32, etc.

Teaching comes before baptizing.

Second, we must wait and watch for a proper "RECEPTION OF THE WORD." The word must take effect, and produce certain results. What are these results? We will come at once to the particulars.

1. CONVICTION of sin is placed before baptism. See John 16:8; Acts 2:37; 16:30; I Cor. 14:24, 25; Rom. 7:9-13, etc. Some say conviction in Acts 2:37 was the result of faith, but Christ in John 16:8 put it the other way. But conviction often results in Exasperation. Luke 3:19, 20; Acts

7:54; I Tim. 5:20; Heb. 12:5-11; Rev. 3:19. Reprove and rebuke in some of these Scriptures should be "convict." So, also, we must hinder baptism for the right Fruit of Conviction, which is—

2. CONTRITION. Follow conviction with exhortation, and turn Exasperation into Contrition. That is in the Way to Baptism. "The point we know not where, and the time we know not when, that turns the destiny of men," is perhaps right there. Convert exasperation into contrition. See Psa. 34:18; 51:17; Isa. 57:15; 66:2. The "strive" of Luke 13:24 should be agonize, and refers to the same thing. You see this in the thief on the cross, the Publican, Luke 18:13, and in James 4:8. The contrite is the "sick" that needs a physician. Contrition is the godly sorrow that works repentance. There is such an experience for all who would walk the Way to Baptism. Let baptism be hindered for want of Conviction and Contrition, such as the Bible describes.

3. REPENTANCE is also a prerequisite, and is in the Way to Baptism, and for the want of which, let baptism always be hindered. See Matt. 3:1; 4:17; 11:20; Mark 1:15; 6:12; Acts 2:38; 3:19; 8:22; 20:20, 21. Dives in Hades wanted his brothers to repent. Luke 16:30. The angels in heaven rejoice when a sinner repents before he is baptized, and doubtless weep when one is baptized without repentance.

4. But not only should repentance come before baptism, but the EVIDENCE of it should be demanded. Matt. 3:8; Luke 3:8; Mark 1:4; Acts 13:24; 19:4; 26:20. In this last we see that Paul followed John, everywhere "showing to them of Damascus, and Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea, and to the Gentiles, that they should repent, and turn to God, and DO WORKS MEET FOR REPENTANCE."

So let us demand not only a profession of repentance, but the fruits or evidence of it. I feel safe when I am following both John and Paul, and know I am not safe if I fail to follow either.

5. PRAYER is also a prerequisite to Baptism, for the Scriptures plainly put it before baptism. Matt. 7:7, 8; Luke 18:1, 13; 23:42; Acts 2:21; 8:22; 9:11; 10:2; 30:15; 17:16; 13:17:26, 27; Rom. 10:12, 13; Heb. 4:6; 11:6; James 4:8, and especially Acts 22:16, which ought to read:

"Arise, and be baptized," etc.; "having called upon the name of the Lord." "Repent and pray" is the universal order. All the injunctions and invitations to pray, and seek God in the Old Scriptures, were of course to the unbaptized. See Deut. 4:29; 2 Chron. 6:36-39; Psa. 10:4; 14: 2, 3; 27:8; 69:33; 77:1-10; 83:15, 16; 86:5; 89:7; 107:1-20; Prov. 1:27, 28; Isa. 26:9; Amos 5:4, 6; Zech. 8:21, 22; Jonah 1:14; 3:8, and especially Ezek. 36:25-37.

6. The Scriptures also put FAITH before baptism, and that means saving faith; hence, for the want of it, baptism should always be hindered. Baptism without faith is a farce, and a fatal failure. If there has been no "death to sin," and "freedom from sin," no cleansing by the blood of Christ, no spiritual resurrection to walk in newness of life, then to profess these is a falsehood. To ridicule these vital prerequisites to baptism is the same as ridiculing the way of life and salvation, for there is no other way. The following put Faith before Baptism: Mark 16:16; Acts 8:12; 10:43; 16:31; 18:8, and in all other places where repentance and faith are preached to sinners. No sinner, as such, was ever commanded to be baptized.

7. Another vital prerequisite to baptism is LOVE—not to preacher, mother, father, church, or creed, but love to Christ. Not as a condition—perish the thought! Conditional love and faith, or anything else that is in the way of salvation, is no better than hired mourning and praying. It is so much for so much, and that puts our performance as the purchasing price of salvation. To those who believe this, the price seems too dear at first, and after they get the purchase, they will be confirmed in that conviction. A salvation that can be obtained for the filthy rags of human righteousness is not worth the price. Our Conviction and Contrition come from a producing cause. So of repentance and prayer, and without the cause they can never take place, except as a farce and a form. Until Christ is revealed to us, and in us, as the one altogether lovely, and the Saviour we need, and must have, we will never trust him ; and until by faith we receive the conscious forgiveness of sins, we will never love him so as to live and die for him. The woman who was saved by faith also loved much, because she was conscious of having been forgiven much (Luke 7:47). When God reveals his Son to a sin-sick soul, faith is the fruit of that

revelation; and when the first fruits of faith are experienced, then Love is the fruit of that experience. So as grace works in, we work out. A man that does not know these things should have his baptism hindered. "If ye love me, keep my commandments," and "this is love, that ye keep my commandments," are two omnific blows at sacramentarianism and conditionalism.

8. But DISCIPLESHIP is also a prerequisite to baptism. Of course the right kind of teaching and faith result in Discipleship, but as these may be defective, let us consider the surer test, for the want of which baptism should be hindered. In other words, the Way to Baptism is through Discipleship. Those who believed and were afraid to confess, were not entitled to baptism. Baptism demands more than saving faith. If one is satisfied to be saved, then let him go without baptism: Faith inducts one into Christ, but baptism inducts him into the heaven-appointed service and suffering for Christ. One may have faith enough to cause him to rush in his nightgown to a trouble, but real danger would cause him to run away naked, as did the young man of Mark 14: 51, 52, and John 19: 38. Let them first be taught what it means to be a disciple before they undertake the service of Christ. The pleasures of religion are not such as the world gives. The following tells what Discipleship requires:

Luke 14:26, 27, 33: "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple. So likewise, whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple."

Sometimes the kingdom of heaven requires us to suffer and to lay down our lives, but with us, in this land and time, it is like a great, luxurious tree which birds lodge in for repose. Discipleship to Christ means self-denials and daily crosses; it means to do or to die. I believe this part of the Way to Baptism ought to be taught, and if one desires to be baptized secretly for fear of Jews or Gentiles, parents or children, their baptism ought to be hindered until they know what Discipleship means. It means pleasure or pain, patience or diligence, laboring or suffering, life or

death. It means to burn the bridge and never look back, for such are not fit for the kingdom of heaven.

9. The Holy Spirit must be received before baptism. I do not speak of the baptism in the Holy Spirit which some received before, and some after, baptism, and which was to fit them for greater service; and then to the Gentile house of Cornelius to show the Jews that the Gentiles were fit for service; but I speak of the Holy Spirit in his convicting, converting, and comforting power. When the spirit convicts a man of sin, he ought to know it; if he experiences his regeneration or quickening power, he ought to know it; if he creates him anew in Christ Jesus, so that his mind and affections are changed, he ought to know it. Acts 19:2 and Eph. 1:13, in the new translation, are made to harmonize with John 7:38, 39; Acts 10:45; 11:15-17; 15:8-11, and Gal. 3:2. If the works of the flesh in Gal. 5:19-21 are "manifest," so are the fruits of the Spirit in verses 22 and 23 of the same chapter. That new kind of love, joy, peace, long-suffering, etc., should be as manifest as the works of the flesh. One who has these in their spiritual sense, has the Holy Spirit, and his baptism ought to be hindered if he has them not. These are in the Way to Baptism, and whoever gets to baptism without these blessed experiences, gets there through the window, or some forbidden way. You had better hinder baptism than hurry it.

10. But I go yet further and say that not only should these all be professed, but EVIDENCE should be demanded. The eunuch went up hundreds of miles not only for to worship, but he went up worshipping. Of course he engaged in worship while there; and on his return he was eagerly enquiring for the way of truth. That significant pause, that some one tried to fill with the 37th verse, is the very place where Philip examined his candidate. Nothing can be more evident. The interpolation tries to give said examination, but it fails like every other effort of man to manufacture Scripture. The man's cautiousness in asking the question, "What doth hinder me?" shows his apprehension of spiritual qualifications. Philip doubtless asked about his faith—the faith of his heart, and about his belief that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, but the Evidence of his conversion was more than that. Philip recognized him as of the elect, for he had a special commission to leave his great revival in Samaria, and



hurry down south of Jerusalem, and both providence and grace managed the conjunction with, and introduction to, and instruction for, a man who was such a devout worshiper of God. This man had charge of all the queen's treasure, and the great sacrifice of time and expense, to go so far, and to be gone so long, and all "for to worship," is more Evidence than is required these days. So of Paul in Acts 9:17, 18, and Rom. 7:8-13. So of Cornelius in 10:44-47, with 11:15-18, and 15:7-11. The woman in Luke 7:36-50 had a rich experience which all such should have before baptism, and she was anxious to show it. The Publican who went up to the temple to pray in such miserable plight, and went down to his house justified, having peace with God, experienced a glorious change that all such ought to experience before baptism. The change from "piercing of the heart" to "gladly receiving the word" was like Evidence in Acts 2:37-47. It is not much to be born of God or of the Spirit if one can't know it, and whosoever believes or loves has been born of God and knows God.

This is a question of momentous importance. It has been caricatured until our practice is becoming more and more lax, and, in consequence, our churches are being filled with immersed sinners, whose hope of salvation is thereby probably, if not utterly, taken away. If a great moral and spiritual fitness is not inquired into, then soon it will not be required; if not exacted, it will not be expected, and if not taught, then, of course, it will not be sought, and hence none will be had.

By removing these hindrances to baptism we can rapidly increase our numbers; but what would it amount to, but "making merchandise of souls?" We think we need their money and influence, and to secure these, and keep others from getting them, we make wide the gate, and broad the way, and smooth as well. We take them in for temporary gain, and if this is not "merchandise," I know not why. Does this not mean that we are willing to hazard their eternal ruin for the little temporary gain that might accrue to our churches? If the incestuous man must be turned out that he might be saved (I Cor. 5:5); and if the parables of the Tares and Net teach that association of the good and bad will not produce regeneration; and as observation abundantly corroborates the Bible doctrine that churches ought to be kept pure; and as the Scriptures urge careful reception and faithful expulsion, that the body may be

unleavened; and as the greatest danger lies in the door of entrance kept ajar, ought not a faithful vigilance be kept at the door, that the unworthy may not enter, and devour the peace and destroy the influence of the church, as well as their own souls?

Our people need to know the Scriptures on this subject. A full discussion of it would require a consideration of the whole plan of salvation; for one must be saved before he is baptized. This is so plainly and abundantly taught in the Scriptures that none ought to deny it. To be a disciple and a Christian in modern parlance is the same thing. Then as sure as infant baptism is the baptism of infants, and clinic baptism is the baptism of clinics, and believer's baptism is the baptism of believers, so sure is Christian baptism the baptism of Christians. The sinner who is baptized before he is saved, or in order to be saved, can't have Christian baptism, but sinner baptism. The sprinkling of a dead infant is just as efficacious as the sprinkling of a live one, because both are dead to the ordinance. And so of adults. The man who is spiritually dead is as much disqualified as the man who is physically dead, because both are dead to the ordinance. I had rather baptize the dead body of a saint than the live body of a sinner. These in brief are the Positive Hindrances to Baptism, or those that are in the way of all alike, and to which there is no exception, and from which there is no excuse. The Way to Baptism is through these experiences of grace, for the want of any one of which, let baptism be Hindered. We will next notice the POSSIBLE Hindrances to baptism, or those in the way of some and not of others. This is also a very practical and important part of the subject.

### **POSSIBLE HINDRANCES.**

The POSITIVE Hindrances are such as are common to all. We come now to the exceptional cases, or the Possible ones.

1. UNITARIANISM should hinder baptism. I care not what a Unitarian might profess, his doctrine should debar him from baptism. No one can excel a Unitarian when it comes to eulogizing Christ. They think he was the best and greatest man the earth ever saw, and that in an uncommon sense he was, like Abraham and others, a, or more emphatically perhaps

the, Son of God; but they deny that he was God, or that he was peculiarly the divine Son of God. They deny the Deity of both the Son and the Spirit. But if Christ was not what he professed to be, then he was an impostor, and a blasphemer, and ought to have been put to death. Now as we have left us the formula of baptism, and that requires us to baptize unto the one name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and as the Scriptures abundantly, from Genesis to Revelation, teach the doctrine of the Trinity, I would not baptize one who denies it. I care not what his moral character might be, nor his personal excellencies in every other way, nor what my views might be on the importance of baptism; even though I believed it to be a saving ordinance; I would refuse him, and tell him to stay out of the water until he was disciplined to Christ, not only as the greatest teacher, but also as Lord and King. If he did not "make the world, and all that therein is, visible and invisible, thrones, dominions, principalities and powers;" if he has not all authority in heaven and upon earth, and is to judge the quick and dead at his appearing and kingdom, then let us all forsake him, and denounce him as the arch deceiver of all time. A Trinitarian who would baptize a Unitarian is the greater sinner of the two. If baptism would not, and could not, save a Unitarian from his damnable heresy, then why baptize him? His water baptism would only add to the flames of his baptism in fire. It would greatly add to his damnation.

2. UNIVERSALISM should be counted as an immovable Hindrance to Baptism. Should such an one profess every Positive prerequisite before mentioned; if he should be very pronounced against Unitarianism; should he believe the Divinity of Christ, and the inspiration of all the Scriptures; if his morality should be above that of Nicodernus; if he should be wiser than Solomon, and more learned and logical than Paul; if he should be willing to give all his goods to feed the poor, and then his body to be burned; yea, if he could speak with tongues, and prophesy, and work miracles, and cast out devils in Christ's name, I would deny the genuineness of his Conviction, Repentance, and Faith, and the Spirituality of his Love. And why? Because his faith is false and fallacious. He believes that Christ died for all men in the same sense, and that by his death he saved all men, and he thinks Christ lied when he limited salvation to the believer, and also when he said: "He that believeth not shall be damned." He thinks Judas betrayed his Lord and then beat him to heaven. Christ

said, "Except a man repent, he shall perish." Universalists deny it. Christ said: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment;" and "where the worm dieth not and the fire is never quenched." The Universalist says: "Horrible !" I ask him: Do you believe that he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned? He says the first in no particular sense, and the last he rejects in toto. A man who believes thus has never been convicted of sin by the Holy Spirit; as never had a penitent heart; has never believed to the saving of his soul; has no conscious forgiveness of sins; has no experimental religion of the spiritual kind; and to baptize him on such a faith is an endorsement of his faith as a sufficient prerequisite to baptism, and also as sufficient for salvation. If baptism can't save a man from Unitarianism and Universalism, then it can't save him from hell, for these doctrines came from hell, and were sent out with the devil's missionaries to decoy men to hell. And they are sufficient for damnation, despite all the excellencies of human character that are possibly attainable. I know the first with a pious sentiment would excuse Christ, and make him innocent in his blasphemies; and the pious sentiment in the second, of magnifying the exceeding goodness of God, but the devil tips every damnable heresy with a pious sentiment. He intimates, and makes believe, that infant rantism may do the child good, although it has sent to hell more than all other damnable heresies combined. But let me say that Roman Catholic and Protestant infant sprinkling is just as good as Greek Catholic trine immersion, whether of infant or of adult; as good as Mormon and Campbellite immersion of a believer that is yet in his sins. And why? Because none of it is from heaven, but of men if not from the pit. I will go further and say that any and all of these are just as good as the same kind of subjects baptized by the authority of a Baptist church; or by a church of Christ, if that will make it any stronger. Baptism has its important place and purpose, but as a savior it is as much a failure as any other "likeness" or "figure," or image or idol.

3. WANT OF WATER is a hindrance to baptism. If I believed in sprinkling and pouring or immersion, and believed that except one be baptized by one of these ways he could not be saved, I would not use sand, or oil, or milk, or any flux, or fluid, but only WATER. The Bible says water; and the specification of that is the prohibition of the others.

Perhaps all are agreed on this. Let me drop a pointer here. Suppose a company is crossing the desert, and one repents and believes and confesses, and wants to be baptized. Would all this preparation on the human side, with the Trinity and a trinity of graces, mercy, pity, and grace on the other side, all be helpless because there was no water there? Shame on it!

4. INSUFFICIENCY of Water should hinder baptism. If there is not enough to "go down into," or "come up out of;" if not enough to "bury" in, to immerse in, then baptism is impossible, or at least impracticable, and there is no obligation in the matter. If I believed that immersion was essential to salvation, and had not a sufficiency of water, I would not resort to pouring or sprinkling; for while immersion is essential to baptism, the others could do no good. If baptism is a clothing, then a little water on the forehead leaves the candidate naked. If it is a planting, a little dirt sprinkled on, leaves it exposed, or unplanted. If it is a burial, and one finger is out, you would declare the body is not buried. A railroad ran through a graveyard, and left a woman's hair exposed. The court decided the body was not buried, and forced the railroad to rebury. A Protestant held his first protracted meeting with one of the Indian tribes that knew only baptism in water. They had never heard of sprinkling and pouring, and the preacher was afraid to preach them, lest he hurt his meeting. On the last day, having assembled his candidates on the front seat, he went to the first with his pitcher of water. The Indian asked: "What you gwine do wid dat pitcher?" He said, Baptize you. "Ooch!" said he, "you no git dis Indian in dat pitcher." And as the story ran, he didn't get any of them in, and so he had to take them to where there was "much water." Some are taught from infancy to say that "a drop is as good as an ocean," and then it is good-by ocean, and immersion. They profess to believe that immersion is one way, and yet they say a drop is as good as an ocean. Ask them about navigation, and conflagration, and irrigation, and they still say a drop is as good as an ocean. Ask them how they can pour a drop, or sprinkle a drop, and you get the same reply. So those who have not a love of the truth, God gives over to believe a lie, because they are bent on it. A sufficiency of Water is necessary.

Pouring begun with circumfusion, or enough water to produce the

effect of immersion, but only on the dying. Recovery made this invalid.

5. IGNORANCE ON DESIGN should be a hindrance to baptism. Dr. T. T. Eaton says that a chronic rheumatic professed religion, and after prayer over his duty to be baptized, that he yielded obedience, as the rheumatic was not excepted in the command. He began to amend from the time of his baptism. A lady afflicted the same way applied to him for baptism for the like healing. But he told her that baptism was not for rheumatism. So he hindered her, because she was ignorant of the design. Baptism is not for the afflictions of the flesh, nor for the filthiness of the flesh, which is sin. It does wash the dirt from the body, as a fit emblem of sins washed away from the soul by the blood of the covenant, but be sure to keep them out of the water until they know the design, which is to show our union with Christ in his death and resurrection, to show our freedom from sin and our newness of life. "The like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filthiness of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

6. Baptism should be hindered if there is NO ADMINISTRATOR. We are not to baptize ourselves, but be baptized; not Active, but Passive voice. The Middle Voice is once used. Acts 22:16: "Arise and have yourself baptized." These establish the necessity of an administrator. If I believed I could not be saved without baptism, and if I knew that I would die before an administrator could get to me, and if I were convenient to water, and could baptize myself, it would be wrong for me to do it, as the specification of the other way is a prohibition of se-baptism. Let those who believe that baptism is necessary to salvation blush with shame, as they see how the providences of God, over which we have no control, would hinder our salvation by hindering our baptism.

7. A PROPER ADMINISTRATOR is necessary to baptism. There is a proper candidate, at the proper place, wanting to be baptized. The first that passes is a woman, a Christian woman, a Baptist woman. She has the strength and the skill, and can do it as gracefully as a man; but we all agree to let her pass, because she is not a Proper Administrator.

Then comes an infidel, polite and accommodating, and ready to serve if

acceptable. But we all agree that he is not a Proper person to officiate in this holy ordinance. For sufficient reasons we let the Jew pass, because of his infidelity about Christ. Then the Layman comes along, and somehow we are all agreed that laymen, as such, are not Proper administrators of baptism. The next that comes is the deacon, and it is not certain whether it was Philip the deacon, or Philip the apostle, or Philip the evangelist, who was one of the seven deacons, but who changed his office at some time, we know not when, that baptized the eunuch. So to make sure of it, we let the deacon pass, and wait for a preacher. And yonder he comes. He is a good preacher, and has led many souls to Christ; but not to, but from, baptism. The candidate asks baptism at his hands. He says, Certainly, and then gets a horn or cup to pour or sprinkle water on him. The candidate protests, and asks immersion, and then the preacher protests. He does not hesitate to say that it is indecent, and not commanded, but to satisfy the conscience of the candidate, he will violate his own. Then the candidate instinctively knows that if he refused it for himself, and does not believe it was commanded, that he would act the hypocrite in performing it, and so he excuses him, and waits till one comes who has received it, who believes in it, and is every way qualified to administer it. That is safe. So wait always for a proper administrator. Let us do rightly what is to be done but once.

Now, what think you of that thing called baptism, that is wanting in every one of these prerequisites? Where they had not been taught, and where there was no reception of the word; where there had been no conviction of sin or of condemnation; no contrition for sin; no confession of sin; no repentance from sin; no prayer for forgiveness of sin; no faith bringing remission of sin no Love to him who forgives sin; no Holy Spirit to either convict or comfort; no Discipleship to Jesus as Lord and King; no recognition of the Trinity; where there was not a sufficiency of water; where there was a perverted Design; where there was no proper administrator, and hence no authority from heaven; the WHICH wrong; the WHENCE wrong; the WHAT wrong; the WHY wrong; the WHERE wrong; the WHEN wrong; the WHO wrong; the WHOM wrong; the WAY to Wrong; the WAY of wrong; the WAY from wrong; wrong as a whole, and wrong in all of its parts; wrong to those doing it; to those receiving it; to those beholding it; to those believing it; to those preaching it; to those

supporting it; and to those inheriting it; and worse than all is the wrong to him who ordained it. When Satan put it into the head of the pope to tamper with the Lord's ordinance of all Righteousness, he made clean work of it; he knocked every jot and tittle of divine truth out of it; he left not the semblance of a shade of a shadow of truth in the whole senseless, sacrilegious farce. And, alas! that is what more than nine-tenths of the professing Christian world have. Yet, they believe that baptism is necessary to salvation. Then if Christ will judge them by the words that he spoke, and will judge them out of their own mouths, seeing they have not that which they confess is necessary to salvation, he will be bound to judge them to eternal condemnation.

I especially ask the attention of our country and village churches to the next two:

8. UNCLEAN WATER should be counted a hindrance to baptism. The way to baptism is to "much water," and "Pure water." Both of these are specified, and according to the rule, the others are forbidden. "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our hearts washed with PURE WATER." This word *Katharos* occurs twenty-eight times, and sixteen times translated pure, eleven times clean, and one time clear. This settles it, and filthy ponds should be ruled out. At Jerusalem they had pools, and at other places they had running water. Well, a pond is a pool if it is clean. Let Baptists be more particular in providing Pure water.

9. ICE WATER should be a hindrance to baptism. I don't mean water that is under the ice, but water that is as cold as ice. I tried it once, and never did an ordinance suffer more than that, there and then. His commandments are not grievous, but joyous. Females and delicate persons should not be tortured in baptism. We have no such example.

My sad experience was in a baptistry that was kept filled from the roof, but allowed to freeze and then thaw.



## CHAPTER X.

### THE WAY OF BAPTISM.

THE "way" of this truth has perhaps been evil spoken of more than any way. Yet it is so plain that a wayfaring man need not err therein; and would not, but for the many crying lo! here; and lo! there. No other controverted subject has so much on the right side, and so little on the other. It is one of the one-sided subjects. Those of the contrary part have but one thing to prove, and that is, had the pope or council—or church, so-called—the right to change the ordinances? for this is what they did, claiming the authority to do so.

### ROMAN CATHOLIC BIBLE ON BAPTISM.

In the Douay Bible with Haydock's notes, endorsed and approved by the pope, published by Edward Dunigan & Brother, 151 Fulton Street, New York, 1852, we find the following:

"Matt. 3, verse 6th. *Baptized*. The word baptism signifies a washing, particularly when it is done by *immersion* or by *dipping* or *plunging* (italics his) a thing under water, which was formerly the ordinary way of administering the sacrament of baptism. But the church, which cannot change the least article of the Christian faith, is not so tied up in matters of discipline and ceremonies. Not only the Catholic church, but also the pretended reformed churches, have altered this primitive custom in giving the sacrament of baptism, and now allow of baptism by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person baptized; nay, many of their ministers do it nowadays by filliping a wet finger and thumb over the child's head, or by shaking a wet finger or two over the child, which it is hard enough to call a baptizing in any sense."

Again, on Mark 1:9, we find:

"See notes on Matt. 3. That Christ was baptized by immersion is clear from the text; for he who ascended out of the water must first have descended into it. And this method was of general use in the church for 1,300 years, as appears from the acts of councils and ancient rituals."

Here we have the statement of a Catholic divine, endorsed by the pope, that the Roman Catholics did change the ordinance of baptism from immersion to sprinkling. Additional testimony could easily be furnished.

Not only was the Way changed from immersion to pouring or sprinkling, but all of the other eleven W's were also changed. Let them prove they had a right to change "rites," and it will be all right. To attempt anything else is the foolishness of folly. Why should the Way of baptism that is acknowledged "by all the world," be assailed with, such assiduity? is the mystery of the "Mystery." (See how large that word is written in Rev. 17:5.) Of the many ways of applying water to subjects, but two ways are contended for by the adversaries, and both are wrong; and of the many ways of applying the subjects to the water, but one way is contended against, and that the right way. All agree that three ways were not commanded, nor was any one of the three ways commanded to be chosen as the equal of the others. All the Catholics, Roman and Greek, with all Immersionists, and the scholars of all Protestant denominations, agree that immersion was commanded, but that on one ground or another pouring or sprinkling will do as well. Yet the Protestant masses hate immersion as they hate nothing else. This does not always prove a bad heart in general, but wrong teaching and leadership on this particular subject.

The old ways of presenting the proof on this subject are sufficient for any honest enquirer, but as there is such a demand for new things, and for old things in new dress, I thought a different presentation of the matter might catch the attention and interest of some who are prejudiced against the old ways. I like the lawyer's way of first getting the Facts; then the Testimony in support of the Facts, and then the Argument based on the Facts and the Testimony. Sometimes the Facts and the Testimony are so abundant that they will submit the case without the argument. When not so abundant, they try to supply the deficiency with sufficiency of argument. When the Facts and Testimony are entirely wanting, then is the necessity for much argument—so-called. But argument not based on Facts and Testimony is delusive. False premises may yield inferences, but not conclusions.

Now for some plain FACTS, first; then a little TESTIMONY; and very little ARGUMENT, and the case will be submitted.

It is a FACT that all agree that the three Ways were not commanded.

It is a FACT that Old-school Presbyterians will not administer immersion, nor allow their preachers to do so, yet will receive it when administered by others.

It is a FACT that Protestants generally will receive and also administer it, while denying that it was commanded.

It is a FACT that Baptists receive and administer only that which they believe was commanded.

It is a FACT that Immersion is never used interchangeably with Pouring and Sprinkling.

It is a FACT that in Greek the words are as distinct as in English.

It is a FACT that the word for pour, with its compounds, is nineteen times translated sprinkle, but the words for sprinkle and pour are never interchangeable with that for immerse.

It is a FACT that one Prof. Drisler, in the First American edition of Liddell & Scott, had "pour" as a remote meaning of Baptizo, but that he was forced by Pedobaptist scholarship to leave it out of all subsequent editions. So of the First English edition.

Now for some of the VERBAL FACTS of these words in dispute.

It is a FACT that the English word

## **POUR**

is found one hundred and forty-seven times in the Old Scriptures, and is the translation of thirty-one Greek words, but never is one of the words, *bapto*, or *baptizo*. The Greek is a great language for furnishing words for all shades of ideas. Like our word, position, from *positum*, to place, we

have, by compounding with prepositions: apposition, cam-position, disposition, ex-position, im-position, juxta-position, op-position, preposition, pro-position, sup-position, super-position, and trans-position. So by compounding the Greek word *keo*, to pour, with Greek prepositions, we could have *amphi-keo*, to pour on both sides; *ana-keo*, to pour up; *anti-keo*, to pour against; *ante-keo*, to pour before (in time); *apokeo*, to pour from; *dia-keo*, to pour through; *ekkeo*, to pour out (occurs sixty-three times in the Septuagint); *eis-keo*, to pour into; *en-keo*, to pour in (occurs two times); *epi-keo*, to pour upon (fifteen times); *kata-keo*, to pour down; *meta-keo*, to pour with; *para-keo*, to pour alongside; *peri-keo*, to pour around, about; *pros-keo*, to pour before (as to place); *sun-keo*, to pour together with; *hyper-keo*, to pour over; *hupokeo*, to pour under (seventeen times), etc. But while every possible manner of pouring can be Verbally expressed, no combination or variation of the word can be made the equivalent of *bapto* or *baptizo*. These words are so far apart in meaning that they can never be used to express the same way. Hence all three cannot be made to refer to baptism, and somebody is wrong.

It is a FACT that Pour in the New Scriptures occurs seventeen times, but never in those places is the Greek word *bapto* or *baptizo*. This makes one hundred and sixty-four places in the whole Bible where pour is found, but never is the. Greek word *bapto* or *baptizo*. This is a FACT, and no one on the earth will dare dispute it,

It is a FACT that while there are thirty-one Greek words translated pour, *bapto* or *baptizo* is never one of the words.

IT IS A FACT that neither God nor man ever used one of the thirty-one words for pour, in referring to Water Baptism. While pour is used sixty-seven times to express abundance of the thing poured, as in I Kings 18:33, 34; Ezek. 14:19; 39:29, etc., yet the word is never *bapto* or *baptizo*. If baptism may be by pouring, why is baptism not referred to in a single one of the one hundred and sixty-four places where pour occurs? The reason is, that baptism can't be by pouring. As Christ in John 13:5 poured water into a basin to wash the disciples' feet, and as the pouring of the water was not the washing, so water may be poured into pools and rivers for baptizing, but the pouring can't be the baptizing. If baptism

could be by pouring, then we could substitute pour for baptize. Try this. "Know ye not that so many of us as were poured into Jesus Christ, were poured into his death? Therefore we were buried with him by pouring into death." (Rom. 6:3, 4.) "As many of you as have been poured into Jesus Christ have put on Christ." (Gal. 3:27.) "And, they went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he poured him." "Disciple all nations, pouring them in the name," etc. "And Jesus, when he was poured, went up straightway out of the water." But enough. Pouring can't be baptism, hence baptism is not by pouring. I repeat, in not a single case of the one hundred and sixty-four occurrences of the word Pour does any one claim that Water Baptism is referred to. If the Lord wanted baptism by pouring, why did he not in one of the one hundred places where baptism is referred to use at least one of the many words translated pour?

It is a FACT that the word

### **SPRINKLE**

Occurs in the Old Scriptures fifty-five times, and is the translation of sixteen Greek words, but never in a single place is the word *bapto* or *baptizo*. The same is true in the seven places where sprinkle occurs in the New Scriptures. It is a FACT that in the one hundred places where baptism is referred to, not one of the words translated Sprinkle is there used. It is a FACT that in not one of the sixty-two places where Sprinkle occurs is the ordinance of baptism referred to. It is a FACT that if God wanted baptism by sprinkling, he would have used one of these words, or he could not have made his will known. It is a FACT that in Isa 52:15, where it reads, "So shall he sprinkle many nations," that the Greek word translated sprinkle is *thaumazo*, and this word, with its family, occurs fifty-six times in the New Scriptures and is never translated sprinkle. It is nearly always translated "marvel," or "wonder." He shall cause many nations to marvel or wonder is the meaning of Isa 52:15. The context shows it, and Gesenius, the great Hebrew Lexicographer, defines the Hebrew word thus translated, by spurt, spatter, sprinkle, and says that these are the meanings when liquids are used, but in the text, nations are not liquids, and the meaning is to leap or exult with joy, to be admired or

cause to marvel and wonder. Hunt these words in the Gospels, and see how that prophecy in Isaiah was fulfilled. See also 2 Thess. 1 : 10, where it is translated "to be admired." In Mark 6:51 we read, "And they were amazed in themselves beyond measure, and wondered." This began with his birth, continued through his life, death, resurrection, and ascension, and will be more so when he comes again. To take a prophecy like this, and apply it to a popish ordinance that has ruined more souls than all our social evils combined, is an inexcusable error. The text as it reads says, HE *i. e.*, Christ—shall sprinkle, and he never sprinkled water on any one. Ezek. 36:25 reads: "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you." Does the sprinkling of literal water upon a babe do this? Or upon an adult? Read verses 23-38 and see how often this pronoun "I" occurs, and how emphatic it is. If God can do all this by sprinkling clean water, then why demand the blood of Jesus Christ? The only marginal references here are to Num. 19:13 and Heb. 10:22. *Read them.* When a priest or a preacher sprinkles clean water on a babe, or an adult sinner, is that the fulfillment of the prophecy? Let him be anathema who says it. Sprinkle is found in Heb. 9:13, 19, 21; 10:22; 28; 12:24, and I Pet. 1:2. In all these places ashes and blood are sprinkled, and not a word said about sprinkling water.

### **IT IS A FACT**

that nobody says baptism is referred to in the New Scriptures in a single place where the word sprinkle occurs.

### **IT IS A FACT**

that no one will say that in a single place where baptism is referred to is any Greek word used that ever was translated sprinkle. If Christ wanted baptism by sprinkling, why did he not put baptism where sprinkle occurs, or sprinkle where baptism occurs? The answer is obvious. Neither of the two things could be done. Let us substitute sprinkle for baptize. "Know ye not that so many of us as were sprinkled into Jesus Christ, were sprinkled into his death? Therefore we were buried with him by sprinkling into death."

*Katharizo* is found thirty times, and means to purify, but it is never

used to signify the act of baptizing. But if baptism was meant to purify, this was the word to use. But baptism is never meant where this word occurs, and this word is never found where baptism is meant. Eleven Greek words are translated wash, but *bapto* or *baptizo* is never one of these words. Two Greek words are translated bathe, but *bapto* and *baptizo* are never one of the words. They are reserved for their proper places.

It is a FACT that

### DIP

occurs in the Old Scriptures sixteen times, and the Greek word is either *bapto* or *baptizo*. The one exception is in Gen. 37:31, where Joseph's coat is said to have been dipped in the blood of the goat. As there was not blood enough to immerse the coat, the Holy Spirit used *moluno*, which means to stain, defile, besmear; but as this was likely done by the act of dipping, our translators have so rendered it. The Holy Spirit used words rightly, but not always so with translators. It is certain that the blood was not sprinkled or poured on the coat, but that the coat was dipped in the blood, as far as admissible, and that by turning and repeatedly dipping, the coat was thoroughly besmeared. It is a FACT that in 2 Kings 5:14 *baptizo* was translated dip, and that in Job 9:31 *bapto* was translated plunge. In every other case where dip occurs the Greek word is *bapto*. In the New Scriptures dip occurs six times, and in every case the Greek word is *bapto*. In Rev. 19:13 the new translation has sprinkle where the old had dipped. The reason of this was, the manuscripts differed. King James thought the preponderance was in favor of dip, but the Sinaitic manuscript which was afterwards discovered had the word for sprinkle instead of the word for dip. Not that some translators would translate *bapto* sprinkle, and others dip; God forbid! No one with learning enough to translate would ever do the like of that.

It is a FACT that *bapto* is never used when baptism is meant. It is the older of the two words, and had become a little mixed in meaning, so that the effect was sometimes used for the cause; as the dyeing of a garment, which was always by immersing. But *baptizo*, the newer word, was as

clean as the sky, and as it had never been misused, the Holy Spirit and Christ used that word ALWAYS in referring to baptism.

### IT IS A FACT

that the verb *baptizo* occurs eighty times, and is always translated baptize, except the cases where Jewish ceremonies are meant. In these six places it, and the noun, are translated wash, as that was by dipping. The noun *baptisma* occurs twenty-one times, and always translated baptism. So that leaves only one word to examine, as no other word is used where baptize and baptism occur.

It is a FACT that the lexicons, the Talmud, the classics, the Fathers, ecclesiastical histories (Greek and Roman Catholic), baptistries, councils, with the recognized scholars of all Pedobaptists, give their unequivocal testimony to the meaning of *baptizo*—to immerse.

It is a FACT that of the fourteen versions of the first eight centuries—four transfer like King James, and ten translate by a word that means immerse. It is a FACT that of the thirty-six versions next following—in all, fifty—that ten transfer, four translate, wash, cleanse, bathe, the equivalents of immerse; that seven translate cross, as they called it the cross ordinance, but they were all immersionists, and made the sign of the cross when they baptized; that the remaining twenty-nine translate by a word that signifies immerse; but never was a version found that had sprinkle or pour anywhere where baptism is referred to.

It is a FACT that millions of affusionists testify in favor of immersion, but never did an immersionist testify in favor of sprinkle and pour, simple reason for this is that all the Facts and Testimonies are on one side.

It is a FACT that while many profess to believe in three ways, and while they spend their lives and their strength trying to prove sprinkling and pouring, yet never was one of these heard giving one minute trying to prove immersion. This must prove that they are conscious of the Fact that immersion needs no proof, for every good conscience requires it.

It is a FACT that *baptistes* is used fourteen times as a proper noun to



designate the mission and name of John. He was not John the *Keist*, nor John the *Rantist*, because he did not pour or sprinkle; but John the Baptist, because he baptized in water, and not with water, as a wrong translation has it. Scholars and new translations are correcting this. If John had been called John the Catholic, or John the Episcopalian, or John the Presbyterian, or John the Lutheran, or John the Methodist, or John the Christian, or John the Mormon or Campbellite, or by the denominational name of any but the Baptists, the world would never have heard the end of it. Any denomination would have taken the world on that name. But Baptists are forbidden to use it, lest the false faith of some be overturned. If Christ and the apostles were baptized by a Baptist preacher, *and no one denies it*, and if they took up John's work of preaching repentance and faith and baptism, then they were Baptists also, And if Christ used the material John prepared in organizing his church, and gave that church the same officers and constitution and government that Baptist churches now have, then the church he built was a Baptist church, and to that kind of a church, and no other kind, was the commission given to go on with that kind of work, keeping the faith and ordinances as once for all delivered, with the promise of his presence to the consummation of the age, together with his fiat that the gates of *Hades* should not prevail against his church; then Baptist churches have continued down the age, through persecutions, and through dens and caves, and in the last centuries have come up out of the wilderness, having the everlasting gospel to preach to all the nations that dwell on the face of the whole earth. Rev. 14:6.

It is a FACT that Symbolism, Metaphors, Prepositions, Circumstances, Characteristic Evidence, Good Conscience, English Dictionaries, Holy Spirit Baptisms, and Baptism in Fire, all demand immersion.

It is a FACT that of all the varieties of meanings given this word by all the lexicons, not one of them favors sprinkling or pouring. When I was baptized I was "dipped," "plunged in," or "under water," "immersed," "submerged," "buried," "overwhelmed," "covered with water," "sunk," "bathed," "cleansed," "soaked thoroughly," "saturated," "over head and ears"—all of these things given in the lexicons happened to me, but not one of them happened to those who were sprinkled or poured upon.

It is a FACT that when I was baptized the action of the agent passed over to me, and terminated on me—that is, he baptized *me*. But in sprinkling, the action of the agent passed to and terminated on the water; he sprinkled or poured the water, and the preposition "upon" must follow—that is, the water was poured or sprinkled upon the subject. But never is this "upon" found in baptism. We are nowhere commanded, nor do we ever practice baptizing upon anybody, but we baptize *them* "in" water.

Dr. Charles Wesley Bennett, one of the greatest Methodist scholars, says: "The baptism of John was complete in water (*en hudati*). The baptism instituted by Christ was not only in water, but in the Holy Spirit and in fire." Arch., p. 389. So testify Dr. Geo. Campbell, Bengel, Lange, Meyer, Lyman Abbott, American Revision, Twentieth Century Revision, Wyclif, Tyndal, Cranmer, and the Rheims versions. The Latin Vulgate has *in aqua, in spiritu sancti*. Two English versions have with water, etc., and these two erroneous versions may be responsible for all the strife and divisions among Christ's people.

## CHAPTER XI.

**T**HE eleventh W is

### THE WAY FROM BAPTISM.

This is declared to be "To WALK IN NEWNESS OF LIFE." If there was no real death to sin and the old life, there will be no permanent walking in a new life. The baptized man or woman who lives as before, lives a lie in profession, but not in fact. The change is a total one. "All things become new." Not that you love your family or country better, but with a better love; not that you attend church more, but better. You now do all for Christ's sake. "Whether you eat or drink, or whatever you do, do all to his glory." The baptized must walk at once into the church, and in all commandments blameless. But be sure you walk into the church of Christ, and in the commandments of Christ. Those institutions called "churches of Christ" in the Scriptures, are in the world today, embraced in what is known as a denomination, and of necessity such have been doing business for the Lord ever since he left; and as other denominations are known to be of modern origin, therefore they cannot contain the churches, or be the church, that Christ built and gave the keys to, and of course have no authority to act for or as his churches.

In their newness of life the truly baptized are to walk in every right way, and that means in the way of their Lord. He set us an example in all things, and especially in baptism, that we should follow in his steps. Repentance, which was our death to sin, and faith, which was our beginning of a new life, disposed us to righteousness, and we should confess this change with the mouth and profess it in Baptism, and express it in our new life, and thus impress it on all beholders who take knowledge of our ways. As I said before, so say I now again, it is the lesser of the evils to swear unto men and perform not our oath, than to perjure ourselves in the oath of allegiance we made in baptism before so many witnesses. We said we had died to the old life of sin, and that henceforth we would not only live a new life, but that we would openly walk in this newness of life. As our baptism was public, and expressed burial and

resurrection, so it implied that our death to sin and new life should be seen of men. It is the dead who are buried, and the buried who are resurrected. We don't bury till we are sure of death. Baptism expresses three deaths and three resurrections—those of Christ, bodily, and those of us in the spiritual sense, and those of us in the physical sense. And if our bodies are to be spiritual and like Christ's body, so should the New Life, which began with repentance and faith, and professed in baptism, be spiritual, like that of Christ. "Why were ye baptized for the' dead, if the dead rise not?" (I Cor. 15:29) has reference to the physical; but in Rom. 6:1-23 the reference is to all three, but mainly to the spiritual. The latter clause of the fourth verse is emphatically emphatic—EVEN SO WE ALSO SHOULD WALK IN NEWNESS OF LIFE.

I have stated a few FACTS. The testimony is ample, not only on Baptism, but on church perpetuity, as above stated. The promise to be with "you" to the end of the age, means the church in carrying out the commission. The church and baptism go together. If one has continued, so has the other. I hope some time to furnish some of this testimony on the church. But as the Facts stated are indisputable, the testimony is not really needed. A thousand witnesses to the fact that the sun shines would add nothing to the fact, and would be useless only in cases where people were ignorant of it, and incredulous from blindness. No one can be a member of the church of Christ without "the one Lord, one faith, and one baptism." It takes all of these to make the unity of the one body. While men may be saved without Baptism and church membership; yea, must be saved before, and that means without, either; yet I had rather have the one baptism, and the right faith, and membership in the one body, which is his church, than to have all the weal, wealth, wages, wisdom, welcome, wreaths, and all the wherewith with which the world woos and wins. Let me not fail in even one of the twelve Ws of Water Baptism.

## CHAPTER XII.

### THE TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES.

I HAVE concluded to add a little of testimony from those of the opposite side. With the Facts given, and the following Testimonies, the question will be submitted to the conscience and piety of the reader, without further argument. I freely quote from

### CONCESSIONS OF PEDOBAPTIST WRITERS.

In a volume entitled "Before the Footlights," by Rev. F. M. Jams, of Ohio, the author has gathered the testimony of all the principal scholars who have discussed the subject of baptism, whether in the Lexicons, the Histories, or Encyclopedias. These authors are all pedobaptists, and cannot be accused of prejudice against the practices of their own churches, and thus their testimony is rendered the more valuable, as bearing upon the facts of History and Bible Exegesis. Some of them are here gathered for the use of those who may not have access to the larger work, or to the books from which they are taken.

### TESTIMONY OF THE LEXICONS.

Take the Greek-English Lexicon of Liddell & Scott. Its compilers belong to the Church of England, but its admirers and indorsers belong to all creeds and men of no creed. In all the colleges of all denominations in England and in America it is deservedly held in the highest estimation.

Of this great work, the last edition, we have the following:

"*Baptizo*: To dip in or under water; to sink, to bathe, to baptize.

"*Baptismos*: A dipping in water; baptism.

"*Baptisma*: Baptism.

"*Baptistes*: One that dips—a baptizer."

And with these definitions there is a substantial agreement among all

lexicographers, Sophocles, Donnegan, Rost and Palm, Parkhurst, Stephanus, Robinson, Wright, Schleusner, Dunbar, Leigh, Schrevelius, Scapula, Bass, Suidas, Morel, Laing, Hederic, Greenfield, Ewing, Jones, Schcettgen, T. S. Green, Suicer, Mintert, Pasor, Bretschneider, Stokius, Robertson, Passow, Schwarzzius, Alstedius, Pickering, Rouma, Gazes, Bagster & Sons, Anthon, Grimm, and Cremer—all these say substantially the same thing, defining *baptizo* by dip, plunge, immerse, or submerge. In the language of Moses Stuart, we may justly say: "All critics and lexicographers of any note are agreed in this." Here, then, are more than forty thoroughly competent witnesses—men who voice the judgment and enjoy the hearty indorsement of the entire learned world; men who cannot be accused of partiality for the views of Baptists; men whose testimony is embodied in great standard works, at least three of them: Grimm, Cremer, and Bagster—on New Testament Greek, and they all, with one accord, assure us that *baptizo* means to dip, to immerse.

### TESTIMONIES OF THE HISTORIANS.

Mosheim ("Church History," first century): "The sacrament of baptism was administered in this century, without the public assemblies, in places appointed and prepared for that purpose, and was performed by an *immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font.*" Of baptism in the second century he says: "The persons that were to be baptized, after they had repeated the creed, confessed and renounced their sins, and particularly the devil and his pompous allurements, *were immersed under water*, and received into Christ's kingdom."

I quote from McLaine's translation, Vol. I, pages 126 and 206. Mosheim was an eminent Lutheran scholar, and Chancellor and Professor of Theology in the University of Gottingen. His translator, Dr. McLaine, was an eminent pedobaptist clergyman.

Neander ("Church History"): "In respect to the form of baptism, it was, *in conformity with the original institution* and the original import of the symbol, *performed by immersion*, as a sign of entire baptism into the Holy Spirit, of being entirely penetrated by the same." In his "History of

the Planting and Training of the Church," the same writer says: "Baptism was originally administered by immersion, and many of the comparisons of Paul allude to this form of administration."

In an appendix to Judd's "Review of Stuart" is a note from Neander, in which he says:

"As to your question on the original rite of baptism, there can be no doubt whatever that, in the primitive times, the ceremony was performed by *immersion*, to signify a *complete immersion* into the new principle of life divine, which was to be imparted by the Messiah. When Paul says that through baptism we are buried with Christ, and rise again with him, he *unquestionably* alludes to the symbol of *dipping into, and rising again* out of, the water. The *practice of immersion in the first century was, beyond all doubt, prevalent in the whole Church.*"

Neander has probably no superior as a Christian scholar and historian. The single fact that he was a Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin *thirty-eight years* attests his learning and his competency as a witness.

Augusti ("Archaeology"): "Immersion in water was general until the *thirteenth century* among the Latins. It was then displaced by sprinkling, but retained by the Greeks."

Augusti was an eminent Lutheran scholar, Professor in the University of Bonn, a thoroughly competent witness.

Gieseler ("Church History"): "For the sake of the sick the rite of sprinkling was introduced."

Dr. Gieseler was a Lutheran, Professor in the University of Bonn.

Kurtz ("Church History"): "Baptism was administered by *complete immersion.*"

Dr. Kurtz; a Professor in the University of Dorpat, is a trustworthy Lutheran witness.

Van Callen ("History of Doctrines"): "Immersion in water was general *until the thirteenth century.*"

Winer ("Christian Antiquities"): "Affusion was at first applied only to the sick, but was gradually introduced for others after the seventh century, and in the *thirteenth became* the prevailing practice in the West."

Who can refute these Lutheran historians?

Dr. Brenner ("History of Baptism"): "*Thirteen hundred years* was baptism generally . . . performed by the *immersion of the person under water*; and only in extraordinary cases was sprinkling or allusion permitted. These latter methods of baptism were called in question, and even prohibited."

Bower ("History of Popes"): "Baptism by *immersion* was, undoubtedly, the apostolical practice, and was never dispensed with by the Church except in cases of sickness."

Bishop Bossuet ("Stennet ad Russen") : "We are able to make it appear, by the acts of Councils, and by ancient rituals, that for *thirteen hundred years* baptism was thus administered (by immersion) throughout the whole Church, as far as possible."

Stackhouse ("History of Bible"): "We nowhere read in the Scripture of any one being baptized but by *immersion*, and several authors have proved, from the acts of Councils and ancient rituals, that this manner of immersion continued, as much as possible, to be used for *thirteen hundred years* after Christ."

Dr. Schaff ("History of Apostolic Church"): "Immersion, and not sprinkling, was unquestionably the original, normal form. This is shown by the very meaning of the Greek words *baptizo*, *baptisma*, and the analogy of the baptism of John, which was performed in the Jordan (*en*), Matt. 3:6; compare with 16; also *eis to Jordanen* (into the Jordan), Mark 1:9. Furthermore, by the New Testament comparisons of baptism with the passage through the Red Sea (1 Cor. 10:2); With the flood (1 Pet. 3:21); with a bath (Eph. 5:26; Titus 3:5); with a burial and resurrection (Rom.



6:4; Col. 2:12); and, finally, by the general usage of ecclesiastical antiquity, *which was always immersion*, as it is to this day in the Oriental and also in the Graeco-Russian churches, pouring and sprinkling being substituted only in cases of urgent necessity, such as sickness and approaching death."

Dr. Schaff was a Presbyterian, and one of the most eminent of the scholars and the writers of his age. He was a thoroughly competent witness, and his testimony is worthy the careful study of every lover of the truth.

Venema ("Ecclesiastical History"): "It is without controversy that baptism, in the primitive Church, was administered by *immersion* into water, and not by sprinkling, seeing that John is said to have baptized in Jordan, and where there was much water, as Christ also did, by his disciples, in the neighborhood of those places. Philip, going down into the water, baptized the eunuch."

Hagenbach ("History of Christian Church"): "That baptism, in the beginning, was administered in the open air, in rivers and pools, or that it was by *immersion*, we know from the narratives in the New Testament. In later times there were prepared great baptismal fonts or chapels. The person to be baptized descended several steps into the reservoir of water, and then *the whole body was immersed under the water.*"

Waddington ("Church History"): "The sacraments of the primitive Church were two—that of baptism and the Lord's Supper. The ceremony of *immersion*, the oldest form of baptism, was performed in the name of the three Persons of the Trinity."

Coleman ("Ancient History"): "In the primitive Church *immersion* was *undeniably* the common mode of baptism. This fact is so well established that it were needless to adduce authorities in proof of it. It is a great mistake to suppose that baptism by immersion was discontinued when infant baptism became generally prevalent. The practice of immersion continued even *unto the thirteenth or fourteenth century*. Indeed, it has never been formally abandoned, but is still the mode of administering infant baptism in the Greek Church and in several other churches."

Dr. Wall ("History of Infant Baptism"): "This (immersion) is so plain and clear by an infinite number of passages that *one cannot but pity, the weak endeavors of such pedobaptists as would maintain the negative of it.* It is a great want of prudence, as well as of honesty, to refuse to grant to an adversary what is certainly true, and may be proved so. It creates a jealousy of all the rest that one says. The custom of the Christians in the near succeeding times (to the apostles), being more largely and particularly delivered in books, is known to have been generally or ordinarily a total, immersion."

Bishop Smith ("History of Baptism"): "We have only to go back six or eight hundred years, and *immersion was the only mode*, except in the case of the few baptized on their beds at the real or supposed approach of death. . . . Immersion was not only universal six or eight hundred years ago, but it was primitive and apostolic. . . . The bowl and sprinkling are strictly Genevan in their origin—that is, they were introduced by Calvin at Geneva."

Dr. Geo. Gregory ("History of Church"): "The initiatory rite of baptism (in the first century) was publicly performed by immersing the whole body."

Bingham ("Origines"): "As this (dipping) was the original, apostolical practice, so it continued the *universal* practice of the Church for many ages."

Dr. Cave ("Primitive Christianity"): "The party to be baptized was *wholly immersed*, or put under water, whereby they did more notably and significantly express the three great ends and effects of baptism."

Magdeburg Centuries: "They (the apostles) baptized only adults. As to the baptism of infants, we have no example. As to the manner of baptizing, it was by *dipping* or plunging into the water."

Dr. Geo. Christian Knapp ("Christian Theology"): "To *baptisma* from *baptizein*, which properly signifies *to immerse* (like the German Taufen), to *dip in, to wash* (by immersion). *Immersion* is peculiarly agreeable to the institution of Christ and to the practice of the apostolical church, and

so even John baptized, and immersion remained common a long time after; except that in the third century, or perhaps earlier, the baptism of the sick (*baptisma clinicorum*) was performed by sprinkling or affusion,"

This witness was one of the most popular of modern Lutheran theologians. His *Lectures on Theology*, from which I copy this passage, was translated by Dr. Leonard Woods, Jr., President of Bowdoin College. Twelve years ago the work had reached the twentieth edition.

Dr. Whitby: "*Immersion* was religiously observed by all Christians for *thirteen centuries*, and was approved by the Church of England. And since the change of it into sprinkling *was made without any allowance from the Author of the institution*, or any license from any Council of the Church (of England), being that which the Romanist still urgeth to justify his refusal of the cup to the laity, it were to be wished that this custom (immersion) might be again of general use."

Dr. Whitby belonged to the Church of England.

Dr. Geikie: "With the call to repent, John united a significant rite for all who were willing to own their sins and promise amendment of life. It was the new and striking requirement of baptism *which John had been sent by divine appointment to introduce*. . .

"On baptism itself he set no mysterious sacramental value. It was only water, a mere emblem of the purification required in the heart and life, and needed in an after baptism of the Holy Spirit. No one could receive it until he had proved his sincerity by a humble, public confession of his sins. Baptism then became a moral vow, to show, by a better life, that the change of heart was genuine. . .

"In this case it was no less than the treatment of Israel as if it had become heathen, and needed to seek entrance again, on no higher footing than a Gentile convert, to the privilege it had lost. . .

"He had received the commission from no human lips, but had been set apart to it from above before his birth. Filled with the grandeur of his mission, nothing arrested him nor turned him aside.

"The crowds saw in him the most unbending strength, united with the most complete self-sacrifice; a type of grand fidelity to God and his truth and of the lowliest self-denial, as he summoned the crowds to repentance, alarmed them by words of terror, or led them in groups to the Jordan and *immersed each singly in its waters*, after earnest and full confession of their sins."

Hear this witness still further:

"John resisted no longer, and, leading Jesus into the stream, the rite was performed. Holy and pure *before sinking under the waters, he must yet have risen from them* with the light of a higher glory in his countenance. His past life was closed; a new era had opened. Hitherto veiled from the world, he was henceforth the Messiah, openly working among men. It was the true moment of his entrance on a new life. Past years had been buried in the waters of the Jordan. He entered them as Jesus the Son of man; he *rose from them* the Christ, the Son of God."—*"Life of Christ."*

### **TESTIMONY OF THE ENCYCLOPEDIAS.**

Encyclopedia Britannica (article, "Baptism"): "The word is derived from the Greek *baptizo*, the frequentative form of *bapto*, *to dip*, or wash. The usual way of performing the ceremony was by *immersion*. The Council of Ravenna, in 1311, was the first Council of the Church which legalized baptism by sprinkling, by leaving it to the choice of the officiating minister."

Encyclopedia Americana (article, "Baptism"): "Baptism (that is, *dipping, immersing*, from the Greek *baptizo*) was usual with the Jews even before Christ. In the time of the apostles the form of baptism was very simple. The person to be baptized was *dipped in a river, or vessel*."

Metropolitan Encyclopedit (article, "Baptism"): "We *readily admit* that the *literal meaning* of the word baptism is *immersion*, and that the desire of resorting again to the most ancient practice of the Church of *immersing*

*the body*, which has been expressed by many divines, is well worthy of being considered."

Penny Cyclopaedia (article, "Baptism"): "The manner in which it (baptism) was performed appears to have been at first by *immersion*."

Chambers' Encyclopedia (article, "Baptism"): "It is, however, indisputable that, in the primitive Church, the ordinary mode of baptism was by *immersion*, in order to which baptisteries began to be erected in the third, perhaps in the second, century."

Edinburgh Encyclopedia (article, "Baptism"): "The first law to sanction *aspersion* as a mode of baptism was by Pope Stephen II, A.D. 753. But it was not till the year 1311 that a Council, held at Ravenna, declared immersion or sprinkling to be indifferent. In this country, however (Scotland), sprinkling was never practiced in ordinary cases till after the Reformation; and in England, even in the reign of Edward VI, immersion was commonly observed. These Scottish exiles, who had renounced the authority of the pope, implicitly acknowledged the authority of Calvin, and, returning to their own country, with John Knox at their head, in 1559 established sprinkling in Scotland.

"From Scotland it made its way into England, in the reign of Elizabeth, but was not authorized by the Established Church. In the Assembly of Divines, held at Westminster in 1643, it was keenly debated whether immersion or sprinkling should be adopted—*twenty-five voted for sprinkling*, and *twenty-four for immersion*; and even that small majority was attained at the earnest request of Dr. Lightfoot, who had acquired great influence in the Assembly."

Article, "Baptisteries:" "Baptisteries were anciently very capacious, because, as Dr. Cote observes, the stated times of baptism returning but seldom, there were usually great multitudes to be baptized at the same time, and then the manner of baptizing by immersion, or dipping under water, made it necessary to have a large font."

National Cyclopaedia (article, "Baptism"): "The manner in which the rite was performed appears to have been at first by *complete immersion*."

Rees' Cyclopaedia (article, "Baptism"): "in primitive times this ceremony was performed by *immersion*."

Brand's Cyclopaedia (article, "Baptism"): "Baptism was originally administered by *immersion*, which act is thought by some necessary to the sacrament."

Encyclopedia Ecclesiastica (article, "Baptism"): "It is evident that during the first ages of the Church, and for many centuries afterward, the practice of *immersion* prevailed."

Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge (article, "Baptism"): "In the primitive Church baptism was by *immersion*, except in the case of the sick (*clinic* baptism), who were baptized by pouring or sprinkling. The Council of Ravenna (1311) was the first to allow a choice between sprinkling and immersion (eleventh canon, Hefele, Vol. VI, Sec. 699)."

Kitto's Encyclopedia of Biblical Literature (article, "Baptism"): "Infant baptism was established neither by Christ nor the apostles. In all places where we find the necessity of baptism notified, either in a dogmatic or historical point of view, it is evident that it was only meant for those who were capable of comprehending the word preached, and of being converted to Christ by an act of their own will."

Dr. E. O. White, in the *Western Recorder* of May 29, 1906, submitted the case of infant baptism to a jury of twelve notable men, and here is the testimony and the verdict:

### **INFANT BAPTISM IS NOT IN THE BIBLE.**

Foremost of pedobaptist writers he took Neander, the well-known church historian, with whom few will presume to compare themselves in knowledge of Christian antiquity. In his "History of Planting the Christian Church by the Apostles," he says: "It resulted from the nature of the rite that a confession of faith in Jesus as the Redeemer would be made by the person to be baptized, and in the latter part of the apostolic age we find indications of the existence of such a practice. Faith and baptism were

always connected with one another, and thus it is in the highest degree probable that baptism was performed only in instances where both could meet together, and that the practice of infant baptism was unknown at this period."

In the times subsequent to the apostles, Neander says: "Baptism was at first administered only to adults; as men were accustomed to conceive of faith and baptism as strictly connected, we have all reason for not deriving infant baptism from apostolical institution."

Gieseler, a church historian, second only to Neander, in writing of the second century, says: "Baptism was preceded by instruction." Infants were incapable of being instructed.

Hagenbach, a theological professor of high reputation, in his "History of Doctrines," says: "Infant baptism had not come into use prior to the time of Terullian" (the close of the second century).

Hahn, a learned professor, says: "Baptism, according to its original design, can be given only to adults, who are capable of knowledge, repentance, and faith. Neither in the Scriptures nor during the first one hundred and fifty years is an example of infant baptism to be found, and we must concede that the numerous opposers of it cannot be contradicted on gospel grounds."

Lange, a professor of high standing, says: "All attempts to make out infant baptism in the New Testament fail. It is totally opposed to the spirit of the apostolic age, and to the fundamental principles of the New Testament."

Olshausen, a learned commentator, says: "We are destitute of any passage in favor of infant baptism in the apostolic age; nor can its necessity be deduced from the idea of baptism."

Schleiermacher, a devout man and able scholar, says: "All traces of infant baptism which we find in the New Testament must first be put into it."

Augusti, a famous scholar, says: "Infant baptism rests on tradition, and the practice was gradually introduced into the church."

Lindner, a doctor of divinity in high repute at Leipsic, says: "Neither the baptism of John nor Christian baptism can be fulfilled in respect to newborn children."

Non Callu (Dr. D. G. C.) says: "Baptism can be fulfilled on those only who are capable of instruction; and it was certainly not the design of Jesus to introduce infant baptism. Its later introduction into the church was an effect of erroneous notions which were entertained of the connection of baptism and salvation."

De Wette, a first-rate translator of the Bible, says: "No proof has been found of the apostolical authority of infant baptism. There is no evidence that any, except adults, were baptized."

Gesenius, the well-known lexicographer, says: "How exactly like the primitive Christians are the views and practices of modern Baptists," in baptizing only believers, upon a profession of faith!

This jury of twelve true men, all pedobaptists —many of them of deep piety, all of undoubted learning, standing high as church historians, or theologians, or ecclesiastical scholars—find the verdict that infant baptism "is not to be found in the New Testament," "was not certainly instituted by Christ or his apostles," "was not in use in New Testament times," "was introduced later."

This jury of twelve men, eminent pedobaptists, affirm that the Bible knows nothing of infant baptism.

He then submitted the question of immersion to a like jury of eminent pedobaptists, and here is their testimony and verdict:

### **NEW TESTAMENT BAPTISM IS IMMERSION.**

Archbishop Cranmer, father of the Anglican church, says: "The dipping into water doth betoken that the old Adam, with all his sin and evil lusts,



ought to be drowned and killed by daily contrition and repentance."

Martin Luther, father of the Reform church, says: "Baptism is a sign both of death and resurrection. I would have those that are to be baptized to be altogether dipped into the water, as the word doth express and the mystery doth signify."

John Calvin, father of the Presbyterians, says: "Baptism was administered by John and Christ by plunging the whole body under water. Here we perceive how baptism was administered by the ancients, for they immersed the whole body in water."

John Wesley, founder of the Methodists, says in his notes on the New Testament, A.D. 1788: "'We are buried with him in baptism,' alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion, 'that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also, by the same power shall rise again; and as he lives a new life in heaven, so we should walk in newness of life.' This, says the apostle, our baptism represents to us. Immersion is manifestly alluded to."

Dr. Chalmers, the great Scotch Presbyterian divine, says: "The original meaning of the word baptism is immersion. We doubt not that the prevalent style of administration in the apostles' days was by the actual submerging of the whole body under water."

Philip Doddridge, the famous Congregational divine and Scripture expositor, says: "'Buried with him in baptism.' It seems to me the part of candor to confess that here is an allusion to the manner of baptizing by immersion in apostolic days."

Dean Stanley, a bright light in the Anglican church, says: "In the apostolic age, those who came to baptism came in full age and of their own choice. Those who were baptized were immersed in the water."

Richard Baxter, the great English Presbyterian, says: "In the apostles' days the baptized were dipped overhead in the water, and that this signified their profession of believing the burial and, resurrection of

Christ."

Dr. Hibbard, a famous American Methodist commentator, says: "Jesus was baptized in the Jordan. The act that he performed, we are to perform. His own baptism is an example of the baptism he requires of us. It is his own practical exposition of the meaning of baptism. Nothing but immersion made it necessary for him to go into the Jordan. Immersion, then, is what he meant by baptism."

Dr. Pain, Congregationalist, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, says: "Immersion was the baptism of the Christian church for the first thirteen centuries."

Hon. and Rev. B. Noel, Chaplain to Queen Victoria, says: "The baptism ordained by Christ is an immersion in the water, a being buried in the water. Immersion is meant to be a profession of faith in Christ."

Bishop Bossuet, a famous French theologian, says: "It is a fact invariably admitted, that baptism was instituted by entirely immersing the body; that Jesus Christ so received it, and caused it to be so administered by his apostles. That the Scripture knows of no other baptism; that antiquity so understood and practiced it."

The sum is, that all these first-rate pedobaptists—Anglican, Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists—pronounce that "baptism is immersion," that "Christ was immersed," that "the apostles practiced immersion," that the "New Testament knows of no baptism but immersion."

The verdict of this jury of twelve pedobaptists is solid for baptism, as practiced by Baptists in this twentieth century, on this continent of America. It may be safely asserted that no set of men in the world have studied both tradition and Scripture more fully than they, and their united verdict is that "New Testament baptism is immersion."

Pedobaptists of the first standing in scholarship, of the deepest piety,

of the profoundest research, agree in sentiments most harmoniously with Baptists on the subject and the act of New Testament baptism.

Thanks to Dr. White for this excellent collation of testimonies.

I have before me a book titled

### **WAY-MARKS TO APOSTOLIC BAPTISM.**

It was published by Sheldon & Co., in 1861, and is filled with testimonies like the above. Of course it has not in these forty-five years been answered, because it could not be. When one side of a question loses its own best witnesses its case is hopeless. That our readers may see the wide scope of these witnesses, I give here the index:

"PART FIRST, embracing testimonies from 1852 to 1643.—(1) Baptists; (2) Disciples, otherwise called Campbellites; (3) Friends, otherwise called Quakers; (4) Universalists; (5) German Reformed, Dutch Reformed, and Lutherans; (6) Presbyterians and Congregationalists; (7) Methodists; (8) Episcopalians; (9) Roman Catholics; (10) Promiscuous Witnesses.

"PART SECOND, embracing testimonies from 1643 to 1311.—(1) Lutherans; (2) Presbyterians; (3) Episcopalians; (4) Roman Catholics; (5) Promiscuous.

"PART THIRD, embracing promiscuous testimonies from 1311 to 754.

"PART FOURTH, embracing promiscuous testimonies from 754 to 251.

"PART FIFTH, same from 251 to 128.

"PART SIXTH, same from apostolic age.

"PART SEVENTH, same anterior to the Christian Era.

"PART EIGHT, decisive examples of the meaning of *baptizo* from the

classics."

These witnesses were the most noted of the times and of the denominations, and they tried to make their testimony unequivocal.

The first fifty pages contains ninety-nine of these witnesses, and the rest of the book perhaps more. And this book is not the only one of this character I have, nor is it the largest. As Moses Stuart, the "Carson" on the other side puts it: "It is, says Augusti, a thing made out—viz., the ancient practice of immersion. So, indeed, all the writers who have thoroughly investigated the subject conclude. I know of no usage of ancient times which seems to be more clearly and certainly made out. I cannot see how it is possible for any candid man who examines the subject to deny this." Bible References, April, 1833, page 359.

Philip Schaff says: "Immersion and not sprinkling was the original normal form," . . . It was the universal usage of the churches of antiquity to baptize by immersion, etc.—Mercersbery Ed., 1851, pages 288-489.

Once more from Calvin: "Whether the person who is baptized be wholly immersed, and that thrice or once, or be only sprinkled with water, or poured on, matters very little; but that, on account of the diversity of countries, ought to be free to the churches. Although it is certain, both that the word itself of BAPTIZING signifies immerse, and that the rite of immersing was observed by the ancient church."

The above contains both the opinion and testimony of Mr. Calvin. His opinion which would be ruled out of any court, was, that it "ought to be left free because of diversity of countries." But his testimony is clear; "Although it is certain as to the meaning of the word, and the practice of the ancient church." So Catholic and Protestant scholars concede what was commanded, but think the others will do.

Hagenbach says: "Thomas Aquinas preferred the more ancient custom, because dipping reminded Christians of the burial of Christ; but he did not think it absolutely necessary." Comp. Hist. Doct., Vol. 2, p. 84. Here is

testimony and opinion again. Any court of justice would take his testimony, but rule out his opinion.

Thos. Chalmers, late Professor of Theology in the University of Edinburg, Scotland, says in Lecture on Rom. 6: 4: "The original meaning of the word BAPTISM is immersion, and though we regard it as a point of indifference, whether the ordinance so named be performed in this way, or by sprinkling, yet we doubt not that the prevalent style in the apostles days was by an actual submerging of the whole body under water."

What right has any man to regard it a matter of "indifference?" Such assumption and presumption has brought consumption to the spirit of obedience among God's people. We must "keep the ordinances as delivered," "once for all to the saints."

## CHAPTER XIII.

### THE TESTIMONY OF CONSCIENCE.

**T**HEIR consciences bearing them witness." Rom. 2:15. If the heathen had a conscious knowledge of right and wrong, as their "accusing and excusing thoughts" of one another proved, then the law was written in their hearts." This shows that co-science, or conscience, is joint knowledge of head and heart. The law written in their hearts, caused the mind to exercise itself in accusing and excusing thoughts. Now if God writes the law of Moses in heathen hearts, why may he not do as much or more for his children concerning the greater commandments of Jesus Christ? I believe this is the office work of the Holy Spirit, to "take of the things of Jesus and show them unto us." I not only believe what is written about this, but I have both observed and experienced the truth of it. If "baptism is the answer of a good conscience," then conscience becomes a witness on baptism. An evil conscience, or one wrongly taught, don't want the word of God on baptism, no more than those in moral error want the word that condemns them. Nothing has been more counterfeited by the devil than emotion and conscience, and yet we are not left without hope.

Then what is the rule and the remedy? It is simple. The conscience that has been educated by God's word on any subject will love and welcome all of God's word on that subject; while a conscience wrongly taught by the commandments and doctrines of men will revolt at the word of God. That is the infallible test. If I don't want to know all of God's word on any subject, then I know I am wrong, and my conscience needs converting. And it, like the mind, must first have painful convictions of the error before conversion to truth. Those who are wrong on baptism don't want the word of God on that subject, while those who are right, do. The latter are not sensitive when reading or hearing the word on that subject, but is open to it, and will give delightful entertainment to all God says on the subject. Sensitiveness is a sure sign of error, and intolerance an infallible sign. It has been estimated that not less than ten thousand a year, who have been wrongly taught on baptism, have been driven by accusing consciences to correct the error as seen in the Word. And some of them

have had to leave father and mother and sister and brother and houses and lands to do it. The writer and reader knows many such. A father told his daughter that if she corrected her supposed error on baptism by being immersed, that she would thereby unbaptize, and unchurch, and unchristianize her father and mother and grandparents, etc. But loving her Lord better than these, her conscience demanded the sacrifices, and never afterward was her conscience troubled by reading God's word or hearing it expounded on baptism. While thousands are going that way from sprinkling to immersion, yet never did one, on reading and searching and praying for light, have his conscience so disturbed as to compel him to make such sacrifices to have his immersion corrected with sprinkling or pouring. This shows that conscience is a witness on baptism. While preaching on this subject once, a lady, the wife of a pedobaptist minister, became so agitated as to attract attention. On enquiry of her, it was learned that she was once a Baptist, but having married this minister, she was persuaded that it was her duty to go with him in church and doctrinal matters. Though she could not believe in sprinkling, yet she quieted her conscience, and she was getting on all right till that night when the sermon aroused her conscience, and made her miserable, and she wished she had not heard the sermon.

This proves that her conscience once right had to be eased or quieted or seared, and she thought she was doing well while living on a sleeping conscience. But when the word of God entered, giving light, and carrying conviction necessary to a reversion of her conscience, she regretted it. But she must face that word in the last day, for Christ said: "The words I speak unto you, they will judge you in the last day." But now is the time to get right, for then it will be too late. And he requires that we all get right on this, or suffer loss by unfaithfulness to him.

But a good conscience requires more than immersion. This is only one, and so far as Mode or Action is concerned, it is not the greatest of the essentials in Baptism. I have more fellowship for a sprinkled saint than for an immersed sinner. Indeed, from a Baptist standpoint, immersion is a curse to any sinner, as it gives him a right of way where he can curse the cause and the church more than other sinners. The action is nothing, and

worse than nothing, if the subject and design are wrong. Example: A Presbyterian lady attended my ministry in a town where there was no church of her own. She became convinced that immersion is what the Lord requires. She thought of nothing more. During a protracted meeting in the town she was immersed by one who believes that it was necessary to salvation. The preacher boasted, as he led her into the water, that her conscience would never give her any more trouble on baptism. When I returned I asked her about her faith. If she believed that she was saved before her immersion. If she believed that her sins were forgiven before immersion. If she believed immersion was essential to salvation, and its accompanying blessings of forgiveness, justification, sanctification, etc.; and that God would not hear the prayer of the unimmersed; and that all Presbyterians, Methodists, etc., would be lost for the want of immersion. She seemed horrified at the questions, and wanted to know why I asked them. I told her that the preacher immersed her as an unsaved and unforgiven sinner, and that she had joined a people that believed the horrifying doctrines, and that if she lived with those of that faith, and gave her life and substance in support of it, that she would be a hypocrite. Her reply was, That she had only considered the mode, that she clearly saw her error, and she would offer her membership to a people who believed in salvation by grace, and baptism as a profession of it. So her conscience did disturb her again, and when I immersed her, I said: "This is the right way, and her conscience will be satisfied forever." When baptism is the answer or the response of a good conscience, then conscience being established in the truth, it becomes a witness on Baptism.

Another case of a prominent and highly cultivated woman, christened into the Episcopal faith and communion, she became convicted of sin under my ministry. She thought her error on baptism was her only sin, and she asked me to immerse her. I refused, so she went elsewhere and was immersed for the "Pardon of Past Sins." I told her that her's was a genuine case of conviction of sin, and that immersion would not cure it. She found I was right, and came to me again for direction. I told her the only cure for genuine conviction of sin, by the Holy Spirit, was the Spirit's remedy—viz., faith in the blood of Christ as the cleansing from all sin. She fought it out on that line. It was not to be bought by works, but sought by



faith and prayer. Luke 18:13; Acts 2:21 ; 9:11; 10:2, 4, 30, 31; Rom. 10:12, etc. She found it that way, the only way since the foundation of a world. Her testimony (see Nashville Debate, page 47) was about this: "I was once sprinkled, twice immersed, but only once baptized." She walked the right Way To Baptism and the right Way In Baptism, and now her good conscience is a Witness.

Is this a magnifying of little and nonessential things? Perish the thought! But you say, If baptism is not essential to salvation, then what is it essential to? Important question! Well, it is agreed, that baptism is essential to church membership. Is it worth anything to belong to the body or church of Christ which is his bride, and with which he is to be glorified in the ages to come? If you are unfaithful in that which is least, will you be honored with the greatest rewards? If only "the faithful unto death" are to be "counted worthy to obtain that age," and that "blessed" "first resurrection" "out from among the dead ones," suppose you, those will be counted worthy who have received the mark of the beast in their foreheads or in their right hand. Rev. 13:16. If, as all agree, baptism is essential to eating at the Lord's table, think you that can be the Lord's table that the unbaptized sit down to? If a crown and a throne are to be won only by the faithful in all things, the least as well as the greatest, can the unbaptized and nonchurch members, and those who perverted his supper, and preferred the doctrines of men to the commandments of Christ, and the churches of men to the church of Christ, share such honors? Are the rewards of obedience, and "the blessings that accompany salvation," worthy of our efforts? See I Cor. 3:10-15.

## CONCLUSION.

If John was sent to baptize (John 1:33); and if there went out all Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan (Matt. 3:5, 6); and if Christ walked sixty-five miles from Galilee to Jordan unto John to be baptized of him (Matt. 3:13); and if all the people that heard and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John; but the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him (Luke 7:29, 30); and if the all authority in heaven and upon earth that said make disciple of all nations, said also baptize them (Matt. 28:19); and if he said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16); and if Peter told the believing penitents to be baptized unto the remission of sins (Acts 2:8); and if "when they believed" they were baptized (Acts 8:12), and if as many as believed were baptized (Acts 18:8), and if Peter challenged opposition to the baptism of all who had received the Holy Spirit (Acts 10:47); and if Paul as soon as converted was to be told without further tarrying, to be baptized and wash away his sins (Acts 22:16); and if the twelve at Ephesus, who had been wrongly baptized, had their baptism corrected (Acts 19:1-5); and if baptism expresses or professes our union with Christ in his death, burial, and resurrection, and also our freedom or justification from sin (Rom. 6:1-7); and if Paul thanked God those who were the servants of sin had obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine delivered to them (Rom. 6:17); and if Paul thanked God that the Corinthians had been baptized, not in his name, but in the name of Jesus Christ (I Cor. 1:13); and if Paul would not have them ignorant how that all the fathers who came out of Egypt were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea (I Cor. 10:1, 2); and if in any sense we are baptized for the dead (1 Cor. 15:29); and if baptism is a putting on of Christ (Gal. 3:27); and if baptism in any sense is into or unto Christ (Gal. 3:27); or unto or into the name of the Triune God (Matt. 28:19); if baptism or the washing of the body in pure water expresses or professes a heart delivered from an evil conscience by the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ (Heb. 10:22); and if baptism in a like figure doth also now save us, and is also the answer of a good conscience (I Peter 3:21); if Christ's perpetual, all-powerful presence is

promised and pledged to those who observe the order of his orders given the great, last, and age-lasting commission (Matt. 28:20); if we are to prove our friendship to him by doing whatsoever he commanded (John 15:14); if that is the true test which says: "If ye love me, keep my commandments," and "I will pray the Father, and he will give you another advocate, that he may abide with you forever" (John 14:15, 16); and "if he that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him and will manifest myself unto him" (John 14:21); and if it be true that "if a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come and make our abode with him; and he that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings" (John 14:23, 24); and if we are to know that we love him by keeping his commandments, and if this is love that we walk after his commandments (2 John :6); if hereby we do know that we have known him if we keep his commandments; and if he that saith, "I know him," and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar and the truth is not in him; but whoso keepeth his word in him, verily the love of God is perfected (1 John 2:3-5); and if the martyrs who loved not their lives unto death, and who kept the commandments of God, and held the testimony of Jesus Christ (Rev. 12:11, 17); if such sufferers with Christ and for Christ are his spouse or bride, and if thus his wife is to make herself ready for the marriage supper of the Lamb (Rev. 19:7-9), and if such are to be blessed with a part in the first resurrection, and are to reign with Christ a thousand years (Rev. 20:6); and if the rest of the dead who are not counted worthy to obtain that age and that resurrection (Luke 20: 35), are to go over to the general resurrection at the last day (Rev. 20:5, 12, 15); if only those who left all, or were willing to leave all, to follow Christ, shall sit on thrones in the regeneration of the earth (Matt. 19:27-29); if only those who suffer tribulations, and who hold fast his name, and deny not his faith, and who overcame the persecuting powers of the dark ages, and the seductions of the latter days, and who keep his works unto the end, are to receive authority over the nations, and to rule them with a rod of iron; if only the faithful few are to be counted worthy to walk with Christ in white, and to be clothed in white raiment which is the righteousness of saints; if these are to be the pillars in the temple of God, and are to sit with Christ in his throne and judge the world and the

angels; if in keeping his commandments there are such great and eternal rewards, then see to it, dear readers, that you keep them, even the least as well as the greatest.

Matt. 5:19, says: Those who do and teach the least commandments are to be great, the others the least in the kingdom of heaven. As this refers to the everlasting kingdom they may be everlastingly great, and everlastingly least. In keeping his commands there is GREAT REWARD.