

# BAPTISM

IN ORDER TO THE

## REMISSION OF SINS.

A SERMON,

By A. S. PETTIE, LAWRENCEBURG, KY.

---

FRANKFORT, KY.:  
PRINTED AT THE KENTUCKY YEOMAN OFFICE.  
MAJOR, JOHNSTON & BARRETT.

1880.

1

2

3

# BAPTISM

IN ORDER TO THE

## REMISSION OF SINS.

A SERMON,

By A. S. PETTIE, LAWRENCEBURG, KY.

---

FRANKFORT, KY.:  
*PRINTED AT THE KENTUCKY YEOMAN OFFICE.*  
MAJOR, JOHNSTON & BARRETT.

1880.

## NOTE.

The following Sermon having been preached a number of times, and each time requested for publication, the author, unwilling longer to refuse compliance with the numerous requests of brethren, whose opinions he greatly values, now gives this little work to the public, with an earnest prayer that the Great Head of the Church will bless it to the advancement of the cause of truth, and to the glory of His name.

A. S. P.

LAWRENCEBURG, KY., March 3, 1880.

# BAPTISM

IN ORDER TO

## THE REMISSION OF SINS.

---

That the Greek, Roman, Lutheran, Episcopal, Mormon, and some other churches, hold that baptism really saves, their symbols clearly show. The agreement of these establishments, however, is not perfect. While agreeing in the general doctrine, viz: Baptism really saves, they differ in the minutiae. From all of these, our brethren of the "Current Reformation" differ in some points, but agree with them all in the general notion, *no baptism, no salvation*. Indeed, in this country they are by far the boldest and most plausible advocates of the doctrine of "baptism in order to the remission of sins." To their phase of the doctrine, earnest, candid attention is solicited in these pages. That we may not mistake the doctrine, numerous extracts will be made from the standard literature of the Reformation.

"Baptism was ordained for remission of sins. . . . It is the only purpose for which it was ordained." Campbell, Ch. Baptism, page 249.

"The washing of regeneration—or baptism—is essential to the remission of sins." Lard, Review of Campbellism Ex., page 211.

“Is baptism essential to salvation? We affirm that it is.” Hopson, *Living Pulpit*, page 282. On page 281, he defines the term “*essential*” thus: *Essential* is that which is not only very important, but *indispensably necessary*.”

“By it (baptism) and through it, we are not only translated from the kingdom of Satan into the kingdom of God’s dear Son (Col. 1: 13), but still more: we are translated from Satan into God.” Milligan, *Great Commission*, page 145.

These quotations, and we might multiply them almost *ad infinitum*, teach that baptism is “for”—“indispensably necessary to”—the remission of sins—“translates us from Satan into God.”

Again: “In our baptism, we are born into the divine family.” Campbell, *Ch. Bap.*, page 276.

“A man’s sins are remitted in the instant in which . . . he is immersed.” Lard, *Rev. of Camp. Ex.*, page 232.

“Baptism . . . marks the point of transition from a state of alienation to one of reconciliation, pardon, and peace.” Graham, *Living Pulpit*, page 227.

“The heart of the believer is purified, as we have seen, by the blood of Christ in the act of baptism.” Milligan, *Gt. Com.*, page 151.

These extracts teach that baptism and pardon are simultaneous; that in the very act of baptism our sins are remitted, and we become the children of God. But we have not yet done with these authors.

“Peter made repentance or reformation and immersion equally necessary to forgiveness.” Campbell, *Ch. Baptist*, page 416.

“Nor can we admit . . . that salvation depends on one of these conditions”—faith and baptism—

“more than on the other. The very form of expression which creates the dependence makes salvation depend on the two conditions jointly, and on each equally.” Lard, *Rev. of Camp. Ex.*, page 187.

“The promise (of pardon) is made to depend upon full obedience to the three—faith, repentance, and baptism. They equally possess the element of a condition precedent, and in this sense are equally essential.” Hopson, *L. Pulpit*, page 288.

We have already seen that Mr. Hopson makes baptism “*indispensably necessary*” to salvation. Then, according to these authors, nothing—not even repentance and faith—is more necessary than baptism to remission of sins. Surely the blood of the lamb is not more than “*indispensably necessary.*” But, just here, I would be very cautious. I would not have any one suppose that these teachers hold that baptism *per se*—baptism by itself—procures salvation. We have already seen that Messrs. Campbell and Lard associate repentance and faith with baptism as equal conditions of remission of sins: so Dr. Hopson. Mr. McGarvey states the position of his brethren thus: “There were three conditions of pardon—faith, repentance, and immersion.” *Com. on Acts*, 9 : 18.

Neither do they ignore the blood of Christ. They insist as strenuously as we or any other people, that His blood was shed for the remission of sins. But they place the water—baptism—between the soul of the sinner and the blood of Jesus. The death of Christ avails us naught, until we are baptized. But they shall speak for themselves.

“What are the blessings of Christ’s death? The remission of sins; the privilege of becoming a child

of God ; belonging to the Church of God ; the reception of the Holy Spirit ; the spirit of adoption ; of calling God our Father, etc. We enjoy these privileges and blessings by coming into the death of Jesus Christ. But we come into his death by baptism." Wilkes, Louisville Debate, page 320.

"Do you not know that when we were by His authority baptized, . . . we were at the same time . . . baptized into the death of Christ, and placed under all the healing, cleansing, and purifying influences of His blood?" Milligan, Gt. Com., page 150.

Then the doctrine of "baptism in order to the remission of sins," as thus far developed, in brief, is this: There is no pardon apart from the blood of Jesus. But that blood can be reached only by a believing penitent in the act of baptism. Baptism is a *sine qua non*, an indispensable condition of salvation. But this doctrine is not yet fully before us.

"There is but one action . . . to which God has promised that he will forgive our sins. This act is Christian immersion." Campbell, Ch. Baptist, page 520. "Peter made repentance and immersion . . . equally necessary to forgiveness." Idem, page 416.

"I recognize no human being as a Christian who has not been immersed." Lard, Quarterly, 1863, page 49.

"There were three conditions of pardon—faith, repentance and immersion." "The doctrine of immersion for the remission of sins does not assume that immersion is the only condition of remission, but simply that it is one among three conditions." McGarvey on Acts, 9: 18 and 2: 38.

Here we are taught that *immersion* is essential to salvation ; indeed, *immersion is the one and only act to*

which God has promised remission of sins; that no one is to be recognized as a Christian until he is *immersed*. But we have not yet done.

“The only divinely instituted baptism is for the remission of sins.” “As we have, then, but one Lord, one faith, and one baptism, and that baptism is for the remission of sins, . . . any other baptism is a human invention, and of no value, wanting, as it does, the sanction of the Lord Jesus.” “Among all these parties”—Baptists and Predo-Baptists—“there is no true and scriptural dispensation of Christian baptism.” Campbell, Ch. Baptism, pages 252, 257, 272.

“The action has a meaning and a design, and it must be received in that meaning and for that design, else it is another baptism.” Campbell, Lexington Debate, page 439.

Here it is boldly proclaimed that there is one divinely instituted baptism; that baptism is for the remission of sins; baptism received for any other purpose is a human invention, and of no value. The correctness of these conclusions I question. But that they are legitimate and inevitable deductions from the premises, I have no doubt. Indeed, if we admit the premises of the teachers of reformation, to-wit: 1. Immersion only is baptism; and 2. Immersion is in order to the remission of sins, two conclusions are inevitable. 1. All unimmersed persons are unbaptized. 2. Both those who are not immersed and those who are immersed, but not for the remission of sins, are unsaved. A wrong action, of course, leaves the unimmersed unbaptized, and leaving them without baptism, an “*indispensably necessary*” condition of pardon, leaves them unpardoned. No sophistry can evade the force of this reasoning.

But the same Lord that appointed the action also ordained the design of baptism. We have no more authority to ignore or violate the one than the other. A wrong design, just as certainly as a wrong action, invalidates the ordinance. Then Baptists, and all others who are not immersed, in order to the remission of sins, are unbaptized, or, at best, have a baptism which is a mere "human invention, and of no value." Then, of course, they are unsaved. Otherwise, how very valuable is that which is of "no value!!" Thoughtful reader, perhaps you reject these conclusions. I do not wonder. But be consistent and reject, also, the false premise from which these false conclusions are legitimately deduced.

But this doctrine is not without supposed support from the Scriptures. To those passages which are thought by the teachers of the Reformation to be most favorable to their doctrine, I now invite earnest, truth-loving attention. These passages may be divided into two classes:

### I.

Those in which baptism is not named, though by many thought to be represented by such phrases as "born of water," "washing of water," "washing of regeneration," &c.

### II.

Those in which baptism is expressly named, and in such connections as to lead many to suppose that baptism is procurative of salvation.

I. (1). "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." John, 3: 5.

We are told that "born of water" means baptism. But by whom are we thus instructed? By Christ, or his Apostles? NO. Then on what authority does this notion rest? Simply on that of heretical fathers and fallible commentators. But no father, however venerable, no commentator, however learned, has a right to assume a position and claim the credence of the world. I claim the right to be skeptical until something more than an *ipse dixit* is presented. I demand the proof. This right will be conceded to us the more readily, I presume, since our opponents utterly repudiate the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration which the fathers, without exception, I believe, and many of the commentators derived from this and kindred texts. I certainly have as good a right to question authority as our opponents to question the same authority. And here I do most cordially deny that baptism is represented in the text. Two reasons for this denial shall suffice. (a) If "born of water" means baptism, then baptism is precedent to salvation. The order of the phrases, "born of water," and "born of the spirit," is not accidental. Hence, to invert or change them is to wrest the words of Jesus. But, if the Saviour here teaches that baptism is precedent to pardon, he certainly contradicts himself in this same conversation. In verse 18, he informs us that: "*He that believeth on Him IS NOT CONDEMNED; but he that believeth not IS CONDEMNED*" The unbeliever is condemned; the believer is not condemned—is pardoned. Faith is the line which separates between condemnation and pardon. But faith scripturally precedes baptism. The conclusion is too obvious to require formal statement. Then, if "born of water" means baptism, the doctrine of verse 5 is in direct conflict with that

of verse 18. (b) If "born of water" means baptism, the Saviour's rebuke to Nicodemus was entirely gratuitous; it was unjust and cruel. "Art thou a master (teacher) of Israel, and knowest not these things?" Verse 10. If a stranger comes to me proposing to teach *Elementary Algebra*, and I ask of him the solution of a problem involving principles, explained only in more advanced works, and he fails, I cannot justly reprove him for his failure. My demand presumes upon knowledge to which he makes no pretensions. But, if the problem involves only such principles as are strictly *elementary*, and he fails, he certainly merits a rebuke for pretending to a degree of knowledge which he does not possess. Now, Nicodemus was a teacher of the Jews, and as such, should have been familiar with the teachings of their Scriptures. For ignorance of their fundamental doctrines, he was censurable. For ignorance of other things—things not taught in the Old Testament—he was not justly censurable on the ground that he was a "master," or teacher of the Jewish Scriptures. But on that very ground the Saviour reprovéd him. Therefore, the teachings of the Saviour in this connection must be identical with those of the Old Testament. But baptism in order to the remission of sins, is not a doctrine of the Old Testament. Therefore, it is not the doctrine of the text.

Now, having discovered that the phrase "born of water" does not mean baptism, some, prompted by a laudable desire to know the truth, will ask, what does it mean? I answer: 1. Water, being a cleansing element, is frequently employed by the inspired writers to represent the Divine Spirit as a cleansing, purifying agent. Take a few examples: "I will pour

*water* upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground. I will pour My *Spirit* upon thy seed, and My blessing upon thy offspring." Isa., 44: 3. See also Ezek., 36: 25. Isa., 55: 1. "He that believeth on Me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living *water*. But this spake He of the *Spirit*, which they that believe on Him should receive." John, 7: 37, 38. Jesus said "*water*," but meant "*Spirit*." This is an inspired, and therefore an infallible explanation. 2. The word in the text rendered "*and*" (*kai*)—"born of water *and* (*kai*) of the Spirit"—is frequently rendered "*even*." "Giving thanks always for all things unto God *and* (*kai*) the Father." Eph., 5: 20. Evidently "God" and the "Father" are not two distinct persons. "*God*" is descriptive of the Deity—the divinity—while "Father" is descriptive of the paternity of the I Am. Then, the passage should read: "God *even* (*kai*) the Father." Therefore, John, 3: 5, may read: "Born of water *even* (*kai*) of the Spirit." 3. Bearing these facts in mind, the Saviour's meaning is plain. He addresses a Jew in the language of Jewish symbolism. He first gives the symbol or illustration, and then the thing symbolized. To be "born of the water, even of the Spirit," is to be cleansed by the agency of the Holy Spirit.

(2.) "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself for it; that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." Eph., 5: 25-6.

It is assumed—I say *assumed*, because it is only assumed—by many that "washing of water" means baptism. But the burden of proof rests upon those who thus affirm, and until the proof is presented I

shall stoutly deny the correctness of the position. On this text I remark: (*a*) We have already seen that the term "water" is frequently used to represent a moral element. (*b*) The term "*wash*" is often employed to describe the moral effect produced by this moral element. Speaking of His tender treatment of Jerusalem, God says: "Then *washed I thee with water*; yea, I thoroughly washed away thy blood from thee, and I anointed thee with oil." Ezek., 16: 9. But God did not baptize Jerusalem with water. (*c*) The phrase, "by the word"—Greek *en reemati*, in the word—indicates that the "*water*" here mentioned is resident in the word. This, of course, excludes baptism. (*d*) The Redeemer, in behalf of His people, once addressed the Father thus: "Sanctify them through Thy truth; Thy word is truth." John, 17: 17. This prayer is parallel in meaning with the text. The Church is sanctified and cleansed through the purifying influences of the word of truth.

(3.) "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Tit., 3: 5.

The words "washing of regeneration" are supposed by many to represent baptism. But since baptism is not expressly named, the burden of proof rests upon those who thus opine. On this text I remark: (*a*) We have before seen that the presence of the word "washing," by no means necessitates the use of literal water. (*b*) All acts have moral quality, *i. e.*, they are either righteous or unrighteous. Well, baptism, when received in an improper spirit is, of course, an unrighteous act; and, of course, does not save. But baptism, when received in a proper spirit, is a

righteous act. Then, by this very text, baptism is excluded from all share in securing the salvation of the soul. "*Not by works of righteousness, which we have done . . . he saved us.*" (c) In verse 7, which is part of the same sentence, we learn that we are saved by grace. "Being justified by his grace." But, says this same writer: "If by grace, then it is no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more of grace; otherwise work is no more work." Rom., 11:6. These two passages, taken together, teach that we are saved by the rich grace of God, and that, too, without any admixture of works. Then, here, the Apostle again denies to baptism the quality of a condition of salvation. (d) The very words in question exclude baptism from the text. "Washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Here, we have two *gerunds*, viz: "*Washing,*" and "*renewing,*" modified by their respective *adjuncts*, viz: "*Of regeneration*" and "*of the Holy Ghost.*" The two *gerunds*, thus modified, are connected by the conjunctive word "*and.*" Therefore, according to one of the most common rules of language, the *gerunds* must be similarly modified by their respective *adjuncts*. If "regeneration" is something which is effected by or in the "washing," then, too, the "Holy Ghost" is something which is effected by or in the "renewing." But if the "renewing" is something which is effected by the "Holy Ghost," then the "washing" must be something which is effected by or in "regeneration." But that the "renewing" is a work *effected* by the Holy Spirit, I presume none will deny. Then, of necessity, the "washing" is that moral cleansing which is wrought in regeneration. The literal use of

water is not contemplated, except as the basis of the figure. (e) By way of further exegesis, I deem it necessary merely to remark, that this text is to be explained in the same way as John, 3 : 5, with which it is parallel. "And" (kai) is "*even*"—"washing of regeneration, *even* the renewing of the Holy Ghost"—the first clause being illustrative of the second.

II. (I.) "Once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water. The like figure whereunto, even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." 1 Pet., 3: 20, 21.

From this text we learn (a) what baptism is not, (b) what baptism is, and (c) how baptism saves. (a) Baptism is "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh." The word "*flesh*" is employed with considerable variety of meaning in the New Testament. But, that it sometimes describes the moral condition of man prior to his conversion, even Mr. Lard admits. "To be in the flesh is to be under the flesh, and to be under it is to be controlled by its propensities, evil inclinations and desires. Hence, the clause "when we were in the flesh," means when we were governed by it; which was in our former *unregenerate state*, or before we became Christians." Commentary on Rom., 7: 5. Then, the term "*flesh*" may here be descriptive of man in his "*unregenerate state*."

The words "filth," "filthy," and "filthiness" occur quite frequently in the New Testament. But the word *here* rendered "filth" (rupos) does not again appear in its *noun* form. The *verb* form of the same

word, however, occurs twice—twice in one text: “He which *is filthy*, let him *be filthy* still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still.” Rev., 22: 11. Here it is used, unquestionably, in a moral sense. It is used in the same way in the Septuagint. Then, since this word—*rupos*, *rupoō*—is employed in a moral sense, in two of the three places in which it occurs in the New Testament, and as this usage is sustained by the translation of the LXX, are we not forced to conclude that it is so used here? Certainly: according to a common-sense rule—one of the best established canons of interpretation. Then, the declaration that baptism is “not the putting away of the filth of the flesh” is an emphatic denial of the doctrine of “baptism in order to the remission of sins.” Baptism does not remove our past sins. (*b*) Baptism is “the answer of a good conscience toward God.” The phrase “good conscience” occurs also in verse 16. “Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear; having a good conscience” A “good conscience” being associated with a reasonable hope, is *here* manifestly an enlightened Christian conscience. So, it must be in the text, as there is nothing in the context to indicate that the Apostle so suddenly attached an entirely different meaning to the same combination of words. Then, baptism is the “answer”—the cheerful response—which the enlightened conscience of a hopeful Christian makes to the requirement of God. This, too, is antagonistic to the dogma under consideration. (*c*) Leaving out the parenthesis, of which we have just disposed, the text teaches, very clearly, *how* baptism saves. “*Baptism doth also now save us by the resur-*

*rection of Jesus Christ.*" The resurrection of Christ was just as necessary as his death to the accomplishment of the Divine purpose to save men. "If, when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be *saved by his life.*" Rom., 5: 10. "Who was delivered for our offenses and was *raised again for our justification.*" Rom., 4: 25. See also, Heb., 7: 25. From these passages it appears that we are saved by the resurrection of the Lord Jesus. But baptism is an impressive figure of this resurrection. "We are *buried with him by baptism* into death, that like as *Christ was raised up from the dead . . . .* even so *we also should walk in newness of life.*" Rom., 6: 4. This being true, we can readily understand how baptism saves us by the resurrection of Christ. But the Apostle gives us a still clearer insight into his meaning. "Wherein"—in which—"few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water. The like figure whereunto"—the figure corresponding to which—"even baptism doth also, now save us." The word rendered "like figure" (*antitupos*) appears in only one other passage in the New Testament. "Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the *figures* (*antitupa*) of the true." Heb., 9: 24. On this text Moses Stuart remarks: "*Antitupa, copy, image, effigy, form or likeness, corresponding to the original *tupos* shown to Moses in the mount, VIII, 5*" Com. in loco. From this it appears that an *antitupos* or antitype always points back to a *tupos* or type. Then *baptism* being an *antitupos* or "like figure," is A FIGURE, which corresponds to another figure. Eight souls were saved in the ark by water. This physical salvation was a type or figure of salvation from our

sins through Christ. Baptism is an antitupos, or a *figure corresponding* to this other type or figure. Then, *baptism is a figure, saves as a figure*, and, of course, can not save in any other way.

2. "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and he shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Acts, 2: 38.

This is the Gibraltar of the Reformation. Mr. J. S. Sweeny expresses his estimate of the importance of this text to his doctrine in a style both clear and vigorous. "Does this language of Peter make baptism a condition precedent to remission of sins? We say it does, and *here we will stand or fall*. The controversy hinges on the meaning of the word, "for." We say it here means, in order to." Living Pulpit, p. 275.

From this text our opponents argue thus: The two verbs "*repent*" and "*be baptized*," are so closely connected that the phrase "for the remission of sins," modifies them both, and modifies them equally; that, whatever repentance is for, baptism is for, and vice versa. Hence, as any one may see, the strength of their position depends entirely upon the correctness of their views with reference to the closeness of the connection between the two verbs. Their position is just as strong as, and no stronger than, the connection between "*repent*" and "*be baptized*."

Now, since this text sustains such a vital relation to the doctrine under consideration, it demands a patient and careful investigation. I remark: (a) The Greek, discloses some facts which our translation ignores. The verbs "*repent*" and "*be baptized*," dif-

*fer in subject, number and person.* "Repent" is *second person, plural* number, with the *subject, "ye," understood.* "Be baptized" is *third person, singular* number, with the *subject, "every one of you," expressed.* The merest tyro in Greek knows this. Then, so far as the structure of the sentence is concerned, the duty imposed by the verb "repent" may be absolute, enjoined upon all; while the duty imposed by the verb "be baptized" is limited to those who are penitent. It is certain that the duty of repentance is incumbent upon all who are sufficiently endowed to apprehend their relations to God. It is equally certain that the duty to be baptized is more limited. Baptism is a duty of none but the penitent. In this chapter we have merely an epitome of Peter's sermon. See verse 40. In the "many other words" with which he exhorted the people, doubtless he elaborated these thoughts. (b) It is common usage in Greek as in English, *when any one wishes to give two commands in a breath, to the same persons, to make the two verbs expressing these commands in the same number and person.* But Peter here changes the number and person of the two verbs. Certainly, then, he gives us reason to doubt if the two commands are addressed to the same persons. He also gives the same reason to doubt if the two verbs are equally modified by the phrase "for the remission of sins." Accordingly, Mr. McGarvey admits: "It is possible that some doubt might arise in reference to the connection of the clause—'for the remission of sins'—with the term *repent.*" (c) The two verbs are followed by *two* adjuncts—"in the name of Jesus Christ" and "for the remission of sins." Then, if the connection between "repent" and "be baptized" is so

close as to necessitate their equal modification by one of these adjuncts, why not by the other? But, the teachers of the Reformation will not allow that "*repent*" is modified by the phrase, "in the name of Jesus Christ." Mr. McGarvey says: "It would be incongruous to say, 'repent in the name of Jesus Christ.'" Com. in loco. Then, neither will I allow that "repent" is modified by "for the remission of sins." I boldly affirm that the verb "be baptized" is modified by both of the adjuncts, while "repent" is modified by neither.

Then, the inquiry is this: What is the meaning of "baptized . . . for the remission of sins?" In answer to this I remark: (*a*) Taking this text by itself, we are not necessarily confined to a single interpretation of the English phrase. Two examples shall suffice to illustrate this fact. (1) He works for a livelihood. (2) He laughs for joy. The first of these seems to harmonize with the "in-order-to" theory of Mr. Sweeny and his brethren. But that the other does not, is too patent to be mistaken. Though a man may work to secure a living, he does not laugh to produce joy. (*b*) The Greek is even less friendly to their position than the English. The truth of this remark will appear, if we compare the principal passages in which the word here translated "*for*" (*eis*) occurs in connection with baptism.

"I, indeed, baptize you with water *unto* (*eis*) repentance." Matt., 3: 11.

"Teach all nations, baptizing them *in* (*eis*) the name of the Father," &c. Matt. 28: 19.

"Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ *for* (*eis*) the remission of sins." Acts, 2: 38.

"They were baptized *in* (eis) the name of the Lord Jesus." Acts, 8: 16.

"Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized *into* (eis) Jesus Christ, were baptized *into* (eis) his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism *into* (eis) death." Rom., 6: 3-4.

"Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were you baptized *in* (eis) the name of Paul?" I Cor., 1: 13

"And were all baptized *unto* (eis) Moses in the cloud and in the sea." I Cor., 10: 2.

"As many of you as have been baptized *into* (eis) Christ have put on Christ." Gal., 3: 27.

From these texts it is apparent that, while in the common version we have considerable variety of expression, as, "*unto* repentance," "*in* the name of the Father," "*for* the remission of sins," &c., in the Greek we find the same word (eis) invariably employed to express the relation which baptism sustains to "repentance," "the name of the Father," "the remission of sins," &c.

This word (eis) ordinarily carries with it the notion of entrance *into* an element, substance, or *within* certain boundaries. This will not be denied. But, that it does not convey such an idea in any of the texts cited is obvious. For, "repentance," "the name of the Father," &c., are not elements, substances, or boundaries, *into* which we may literally enter. The word sometimes, indeed frequently, means "in order to," thus conveying the idea of cause, or condition. But that this is not its meaning in some of the passages quoted is apparent. "Baptized in order to Moses," is unintelligible. If any one suggests that the Israelites were baptized to secure Moses as their

leader, I reply: The explanation is at war with the facts in the case. By divine appointment, Moses had been constituted their leader prior to their baptism.

"Buried with him by baptism in order to death," is, if possible, even more incongruous. Mr. Lard has this emphatic language: "We who died to sin; not we who *have* died to sin. The Aorist should be closely followed here. The meaning is, *we who died to sin before our baptism.*" Com. on Rom., 6: 2. Then, baptism cannot be in order to death. "*Buried . . . by baptism.*" Paul and the brethren at Rome buried the dead; they were opposed to burying people alive.

Then, what is the meaning of "*baptism eis*" any one, or anything? Here I might quote Knapp, Olshausen, Hodge, Barnes, Clarke, etc., to show that *baptism with eis* implies *profession*. But, having better witnesses, I forbear. A text, already quoted, reads thus: "As many of you as have been baptized *into* (eis) Christ have put on Christ." Then to be baptized into Christ is the same as to put on Christ. Therefore, a correct understanding of what is meant by putting on Christ will aid us in coming to the knowledge of the truth. The word here rendered "*put on,*" occurs quite frequently in the New Testament. It appears in Rom., 13: 14. On this text, Mr. Lard remarks: "To put on Christ is a familiar metaphor borrowed from the practice of putting on clothes." Com. in loco. To the same effect, I could quote Calvin, Locke, Baxter, etc. But a few passages from the New Testament will more satisfactorily illustrate the force of the word.

"Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye *shall put on.*" Matt., 6: 25.

“After they had mocked him, they took the robe off from him, and *put* his own raiment *on* him.” Matt., 27: 31. See also Mark, 6: 9. Luke, 15: 22.

Then the word evidently means to *PUT on*, as clothes. But we cannot literally put Christ on like a garment. But, we may put him on, professionally, in an impressive symbol. When the epistle to Gallatians was written, it was, and had long been, customary for persons to wear clothing indicative of their age, rank, &c. Among the Romans, there was the *toga praetexta*, worn by magistrates and free-born children; the *toga pura* or *virilio*, worn by youths who had reached their sixteenth year; the *toga candida*, worn by office-seekers; the *toga pulla*, worn by mourners. These different *togas* or gowns were assumed *not* to make their wearers free-born, fifteen years old, &c., but to indicate or symbolize their condition, age, or aspirations. So we put on Christ, not to make us heirs of eternal life, but to symbolize our relations to Jesus. Verse 26 reads: “Ye are all the *children of God by faith* in Christ Jesus.” This teaches how we become members of the divine family—“*by faith.*” The next verse describes a very different event—the *clothing* of the new-born babe. “*By faith,*” we become children of God. By baptism, we put on becoming apparel; assume the proper *toga*; symbolize our relations to God.

Let us take one other passage illustrative of the force of *eis* in such connections: “I indeed baptize you with water *unto* (*eis*) repentance.”

Any one can see that to render *eis* “in order to,” in this text, makes very bad theology. Baptism was not and is not a cause or condition of repentance. John did not baptize those who came to him to make

them penitent. When he saw the time-serving Pharisees and the infidel Sadducees coming to his baptism, he denounced them as a "generation of vipers," demanding "fruits meet for repentance." Matt., 3: 7, 8. With him repentance was prerequisite to baptism. Then, to be baptized "*unto* (eis) repentance," must mean to make a public, formal profession of a previously existing repentance. We have already seen that to be baptized "*into* (eis) death," is to profess, symbolize deadness to sin; that to be baptized "*into* (eis) Christ," is to put on Christ professionally. Certainly then it is possible to interpret "baptized *for* (eis) the remission of sins" in the same way. Indeed, the texts which we have examined conspire to render this interpretation not merely possible, but exceedingly probable—almost certain. But, if Peter may be the interpreter of his own language, we cannot doubt his meaning. He says, baptism is a "*figure*." 1 Pet., 3: 21. Then, whatever baptism does, it does as a *figure*. These remarks, of course, apply to Acts, 22: 16, and make a formal exposition of that text unnecessary.

But that the foregoing is a correct exposition of Peter's language, that Apostle clearly shows in a speech which Luke records in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. In the primitive churches there were many errorists. Some were zealous Judaizers, and wished to impose circumcision and other Mosaic rites upon the Gentile converts. These were unwilling to submit, and hence considerable disturbance arose in the Church at Antioch. Therefore, Paul, Barnabas, and some others, by order of the Church, repaired to Jerusalem to get the decision of the Apostles and elders on this subject. When the

Apostles and elders came together to consider the matter, there was much discussion. Peter was one of the speakers, and expressed himself very decidedly against imposing Jewish rites upon Gentile Christians. He spoke as follows :

“Men and brethren, ye know how, that a good while ago, God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the Word of the Gospel and believe. And God, which *knoweth the hearts, bear them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost*, even as He did unto us, and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith,” &c. Acts, 15: 7-9.

From this we learn : 1st. God purified the hearts of the family of Cornelius “*by faith.*” 2d. God witnessed to their faith by giving them the Holy Spirit. But the Holy Spirit was given to them before baptism. See Acts, 10: 44-48. Certainly, then, their hearts were purified by faith before they were baptized. If any desire confirmation of this, let them read the concluding sentence of Peter’s sermon at the house of Cornelius: “To Him give all the prophets witness, that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins.” Acts, 10: 43. Peter appealed to the prophets in proof of his doctrine. Can our brethren of the Reformation prove the doctrine of “baptism in order to remission of sins” by the prophets? No ; then their doctrine is different from that which Peter preached to the Gentile centurion and his house. 3d. The Gentiles were saved just as the Jews: “putting no difference between us and them.” Then the hearts of the Pentecostal converts were purified “by faith” before they were “baptized, *eis* the remission of sins.” 4th. If the

salvation of the Gentiles was suspended on conditions different from those propounded to the Jews, we, being Gentiles, should feel a deeper interest in the preaching at Cesarea than in that at Jerusalem. But there is no difference; the hearts of all are purified "by faith."

Thus far we have seen : 1st. Acts, 2 : 38, taken by itself, is susceptible of two interpretations. "For" may be procurative, or it may be declarative. 2d. If we make "for" *procurative*, we make Peter contradict himself. I now remark, that to make "for" *procurative* is to make Acts, 2 : 38 contradict *many* of the plainest texts. Notice a few of them :

"He that *believeth* on him *is not condemned*, but he that *believeth not is condemned*." John, 3 : 18.

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, *he that* heareth my Word, and *believeth* on Him that sent me, *hath* everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but *is passed* from death unto life." John, 5 : 24.

"He that *believeth* on me *hath* everlasting life." John, 6 : 47.

These texts are grand in their simplicity. All the cunning devices and inhuman tortures of an Inquisition cannot extort from them a double testimony. They simply teach a present salvation to the believer—every believer. The believer *has* eternal life; *is passed* from death unto life. A contrast is drawn between the believer and the unbeliever. The *unbeliever is condemned*; the *believer is not condemned*. Faith marks the point—faith is the line between condemnation and pardon. But faith is precedent to baptism. Therefore, remission of sins is precedent to baptism.

But just here an objector interposes thus: All texts uttered by the Saviour prior to the giving of the

Apostolic Commission are irrelevant. These texts were uttered prior to the giving of the Apostolic Commission. Therefore, these texts are irrelevant.

Very syllogistic this, but vulnerable withal. Suppose we admit that all texts spoken by our Lord previous to the giving of the Commission are irrelevant. What does the objector gain? He wrests from his own brethren some of the texts on which they have ever most confidently relied to prove their favorite dogma: "baptism in order to the remission of sins." Mark, 1 : 4, and John, 3 : 5, are favorite texts of the preachers of the "Current Reformation." And yet these texts were spoken in the *early part* of our Lord's ministry. Are these irrelevant? Or are only those, which are plainly antagonistic to the doctrine under discussion, irrelevant?

But the objection assumes that the Commission established new conditions of salvation: that if Christ, previous to his death, did forgive sins before baptism, the Commission established an "indispensably necessary" connection between baptism and salvation. Is this true? The Commission itself shall decide. Mat., 28 : 19, 20.

Mr. Milligan, who has written a book on this text, translates thus: "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them," &c. On page 100 he has these words: "Who are to be baptized? Evidently not the *nations* as such, but the disciples." Again: "It is evident, from the terms of the Commission, that the work of making disciples is prior, in point of time, to that of baptizing." The command, then, is to *baptize disciples*. But who are disciples? The Author of the Commission shall answer: "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.*" Luke, 14 : 26. Then, *an essential characteristic of a disciple is SUPREME LOVE TO CHRIST.* Therefore, whatever may be predicated of those who love Christ may also be predicated of disciples. Now, notice a few plain texts. "We know that all things work together for good to *them that love God.*" Rom., 8 : 28. "We know that *we HAVE passed* from death unto life because *we love the brethren.*" "Every one that *loveth Him that begat loveth Him also that is begotten of Him.*" I John, 3 : 14 with 5 : 1.

"God is love; and he that *dwelleth in love dwelleth in God and God in him.*" I John, 4 : 16.

Surely, these texts are descriptive of those whose sins are remitted. Surely, those for whose good all things co-operate; those who have passed from death unto life; those who dwell in God; those in whom God dwells, are saved. Then, those who love God are saved. But we have already seen that Mr. Milligan requires discipleship, which involves supreme love to Christ before baptism. Mr. Wilkes is even more explicit. "If he have no faith; . . . *if he have no change of heart and love of God,* placing him under the water and taking him up again is not baptism." Louisville Debate, page 206. Then, according to our opponents, love precedes baptism. Then, inevitably, remission of sins precedes baptism. The Commission, as recorded by another of the Evangelists, is in perfect harmony with this. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mark, 16 : 16. Believing is precedent to baptism. We have already seen that believers *have* everlasting life. A believer being saved, it is certainly true that a baptized believer is saved.

Now, let us notice a text written long after the Commission was given.

“*Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God.*” I John, 5: 1.

Here we are plainly taught that *believers are children of God*. Accordingly, on this passage Mr. Lard observes: “To believe that Jesus is the Christ and to be born of God are identical.” Review of Campbellism Ex., page 100. The question propounded by Mr. Lard and his brethren to their candidates for baptism is this: “Do you believe, with all your heart, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God?” An affirmative answer is required. Then if the apparent meaning of this text be the correct one, and Mr. Lard’s remarks be judicious, the preachers of the Reformation require their candidates to be born of God—be children of God—before receiving the ordinance. Surely “the legs of the lame are not equal.”

Take another: “Now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets, even the *righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe.*” Rom., 3: 21, 22.

Who can doubt that “the righteousness of God . . . is . . . . unto ALL and upon ALL THEM THAT BELIEVE?” The text is too plain to need comment.

Another: “Abraham believed God, and it was accounted unto him for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. . . . . So, then, they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.” Gal., 3: 6-9.

Here we are told how Abraham became “righteous.” He “*believed* God, and it was accounted to

him for righteousness." Here also two affirmations are made concerning believers: 1. They "are the children of Abraham," which obviously implies the remission of sins. Verse 29. 2. They "are blessed with faithful Abraham." "They are interested in the promises made to him, and they will be treated as he was. They are justified in the same manner, and admitted to the same privileges on earth and in Heaven." Barnes, *in loco*. See also Rom., 4 : 22-24.

Then, if Christ, during his personal ministry, did represent salvation as a present possession to every believer, Paul and John, long after his ascension to Heaven, clearly reiterated his sentiments. The conditions of salvation proclaimed by the Apostles were precisely the same as those enunciated by the Lord Jesus. Indeed, we affirm that, ever since man became a sinner, the conditions of salvation have been the same. Faith has ever been the consummation of the process that makes us heirs of eternal life. We do not ignore repentance. We insist upon it as an exercise of the heart, without which man shall die. The Master has said: "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." Luke, 13 : 3. But we must have everything in its own order. The great Teacher has said: "Repent ye and believe the Gospel." Mark, 1 : 15. The divinely established order is, *repent and believe*. Repentance is one link; but faith is and has ever been the last link in the golden chain that binds the soul of man to his God. "By faith" Abel obtained witness that he was righteous. Hebrews, 11 : 4. "By faith" Abraham was transported across the yawning gulf of twenty centuries, and placed right down by the cross of Christ, and made to rejoice in redeeming love. Rom., 4 : 3, with John, 8 : 56. All

along the highway of ages, God was raising up prophets, like sign-boards, to direct the inquiring pilgrim to the forgiveness of sins through faith in the Messiah. Acts, 10 : 43. And *now* believers are "blessed with faithful—believing Abraham;" righteousness is unto all and upon all them that believe. Gal., 3 : 9; Rom., 3 : 22. But faith is precedent to baptism; therefore, salvation is, in no way, resultant from baptism. Baptism cannot be "in order to the remission of sins."

But just here we encounter a criticism on the term *faith*. "When Paul . . . . . says that 'the Gospel is the power of God for salvation to every one that believeth,' he includes, under the term *faith* or *belief*, every act of obedience required by the Gospel. And in the same comprehensive sense this word is also frequently used by other inspired writers." "Whenever they aimed to give, in a single term, a summary of all that is required of the sinner in order to salvation, they were wont to express it by the term *faith* or *belief*." R. Milligan, Scheme of Redemption, p. 454.

The plain English of all this is, that *when the inspired writers say we are saved "by faith,"* the term *faith* is comprehensive enough to include baptism. On this I have several remarks: 1. To make *faith* so comprehensive is to give to it a meaning which no one would ever think of attaching to it, except in case of supposed necessity. 2. This criticism proceeds upon the assumption that baptism is in order to salvation. But this is just what I deny. Therefore, the criticism is a mere begging of the question. 3. There is nothing in the passages which we have examined—and we have examined those on which Reformers

chiefly rely—to necessitate such an extension of the meaning of the term "*faith*." 4. There are some texts in which it is certain that "*faith or belief*" does not include baptism: "He that *believeth* and is *baptized*." Mark, 16 : 16. See also Acts, 8 : 12. In these texts "*faith or belief*" and baptism are separately mentioned, and therefore are different; the one does not include the other. But this will not be denied. How, then, can we determine *when* the term is employed in its broader, and *when* in its narrower sense? 5. If the term is so variable in the extent of its meaning, *how can we know that it does not extend even beyond baptism?* We are required to "bring our bodies into subjection." 1 Cor., 9 : 27. When the Saviour says: "He that believes on Him is not condemned," does he mean that our sins are not remitted until we achieve a complete triumph over our bodies? When we begin to extend the meaning of a term, who will tell us *where* to stop?

But our opponents think to find support for their theory and method of interpretation from the Scriptures themselves. They say that James used the term *faith* in a comprehensive sense. They appeal to the following: "Was not *Abraham*, our father, *justified by works* when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how *faith wrought with his works*, and *by works* was *faith* made perfect? And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness." James, 2 : 21-23. They say that Abraham's *faith* was imputed to him for righteousness. But it was his *faith* perfected by offering Isaac. So while *faith saves us*, it is *that faith which is made perfect in baptism*.

Here I remark: 1. While I am very far from admitting that baptism has been substituted for circumcision,

it does seem that Abraham's submission to circumcision sustained, at least, as nearly as the offering of Isaac, the same relation to his faith that baptism sustains to ours. Then, if our faith is brought to such a state of perfection by a single act—baptism—as to save us, why was Abraham's faith so slow in maturing? Why were two such acts as circumcision and the offering of his son required to perfect his faith, when one—baptism—is sufficient to perfect ours?

2. The context clearly shows that *James does not make faith to include any works* whatever. He says, verse 18: "*I will show thee my faith by my works.*" Works are only the proper manifestations of the kind of faith which James had. As liberal gifts betoken—not make—a generous heart, so baptism and all good works are tokens of faith. See verses 15 and 16.

3. In Genesis, 15 : 6, we read: "And he (Abraham) believed in the Lord, and He counted it to him for righteousness." That this involved the remission of sins Paul leaves us no room to doubt. "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. . . . How was it then reckoned, when he was in circumcision or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised." Rom., 4 : 3-10, 11. But at the time referred to in Genesis Abraham was childless. Ishmael was not yet born. Now, Ishmael was more than 13 years older than Isaac, and Isaac was a lad old enough to carry the wood for the burnt-offering up the mountain side at the time to which James refers. Gen., 17 : 25, and 22 : 6. Hence it is evident that Abraham had enjoyed remission of sins for a long time—some say 40 years—

previous to the offering of Isaac; therefore, the theory of the teachers of the Reformation is in direct conflict with the facts in the case. 4. It is plain that James is here drawing a contrast between a *mere profession* of faith and faith itself. On the words: "Can faith save him," verse 14, Dr. A. Clarke has the following, which I cordially adopt: "His *profession* of faith: for it is not said that he *has faith*, but that *he says* I have faith. Com. *in loc.* A mere *profession* of even a correct faith cannot save any one. 5. Dr. Clarke further observes: "St. James probably refers to that faith which simply took in the being and unity of God." He quotes Michaelis to the same effect. This, with the omission of the word "*probably*," I accept. See verse 19. The faith *professed* is no better than that of devils. Such a faith, when really entertained, can save no one. 6. True faith involves more than the being and unity of God. "The Hebrew term *believe* means to *rest, rely upon*. The word is *Aman*, from which we have *Amen*, meaning *to be sure*, and then to be *assured*, or to *confide in*. Jacobus on Gen., 15 : 6. So Browne in Bible Commentary. Faith is trust; firm reliance upon God, which necessarily implies a spirit of submission and obedience. Such was the faith of Abraham. His faith was obedient, even to the extent of offering up his son of promise. But the faith was anterior to the work of faith. And *by this act* and OTHER ACTS—the Apostle says "*by works*" (plural), mentioning one merely as an illustration—was his faith made perfect. So our faith, if genuine, is accompanied *by works*. True faith "works by love." And every act of obedience strengthens and confirms our faith, and tends to make

it perfect. But our faith is not made perfect by the single act of baptism. As it required *works* (plural) to perfect the faith of Abraham, so *works* (plural) are ordinarily required to perfect ours. But, as Abraham's sins were remitted before his faith was made perfect, so we receive remission of our sins before our faith is made perfect. We are accepted as righteous when we believe in Jesus with the whole heart.

7. Paul says: "If Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory, but not before God." Rom., 4:2. Conybeare and Howson read thus: "If Abraham was justified by works, he has a ground of boasting; but he has no ground of boasting with God." This reading is obviously correct. The conclusion, to-wit, that Abraham was *not justified by works* is so apparent that the Apostle deemed it unnecessary to formally state it. Then Paul says "*Abraham was not justified by works.*" James says "*he was justified by works.*" Of course there is no conflict in their statements. Hence, it is evident that they do not employ the word "*justified*" in the same sense; therefore, *Abraham was twice justified*, or more properly received two different kinds of justification. He was once justified while he was childless. This involved the remission of sins. Of this Paul speaks. See Rom., 4:3. He was again justified thirty or forty years afterwards. Of this James speaks. Then it is certain that the word "*justified*," in the last instance, is applied to Abraham in the sense of *commended* or *approved*. For this sense of the word see Luke, 10:29, 7:28, 16:15; 1 Tim., 3:16. In the same sense we are justified by works. Thus we have seen that James, so far from favoring the dogma of "baptism in order to the remission of sins," teaches

exactly what we believe. I now resume my direct line of argument.

“Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel.” 1 Cor., 1 : 17.

In the Louisville Debate, I find some remarks on this text, by Mr. Wilkes, which I adopt, pp. 371-2: “Is it true that Paul was not sent to baptize? I answer, it is not true in an unqualified sense. . . . He was not sent only to baptize, nor chiefly; but I argue that he was sent to baptize from the fact that he did baptize. . . . I conclude, in the second place, that Paul was sent to baptize, from the fact that he acted under the same Commission as did the other Apostles. The Commission said: ‘Go teach the nations, baptizing.’ . . . The question recurs, what is the meaning of the language, or what is the rule for its interpretation? I answer, when two things are compared, and one of them is preferred before the other, the preferred one is affirmed, and the other is denied. . . . I will give you an example. Paul says: ‘I was not sent to baptize.’ The Apostle John says: ‘Love not in word nor in tongue, but in deed and in truth.’ What does that mean? Are we not to love in tongue? not to use our tongues in love, not to speak words of love to our brothers, friends, and neighbors? The language cannot mean that, but it compares this thing of loving in word and in tongue with loving in *deed*; and loving in *deed* being much more important than loving in *word*, the one is *affirmed* and the other is *denied*.” Then Paul *was sent* to baptize, but more *especially* to preach the Gospel. The *preaching of the Gospel was a more important duty* than baptizing. That this interpretation is correct, will be the more apparent if we bear in mind that

*Christ never sent any one to baptize rather than to preach the Gospel.* Is this in harmony with the teachings of the "Representative Men" and "Standard Works" of the "Disciples of Christ?" Is there not a palpable antagonism between this text and the doctrine of "baptism in order to the remission of sins." This doctrine, as we have seen, makes baptism an "*indispensably necessary*" condition of salvation. Then nothing can be more important. But Paul says preaching the Gospel is more important. Therefore, either Paul is wrong, or Messrs. Campbell, Lard, Milligan, Hopson, McGarvey, Sweeney, Graham, Wilkes, etc., etc., are wrong. In whose teachings the error is, I need not say. But why say more? The doctrine of "baptism in order to the remission of sins" has been weighed in the balance and found wanting.

But some will say: "If baptism is not procurative of salvation why should we be baptized?" What a strange question for a Christian to ask! What a strange spirit it exhibits! Shall the Lord be compelled to flash damnation in our very faces before we obey him? Shall we coldly calculate how little we can do and still be saved? Are we to submit to no rite, observe no ordinance, unless it be to save our souls? Our brethren of the Reformation admit that remission of sins is scripturally precedent to participation in the Supper. Then if one of the two ordinances which Christ has left to his churches is not procurative of pardon, and yet is obligatory, is it strange that the other also is obligatory, though not procurative of pardon? By the way, the Romanist can make, at least, as good an argument in favor of his absurd doctrine of Transubstantiation as the champion of the Reformation for his doctrine of "baptism

in order to the remission of sins." The Romanist says: "Baptism washes away our sins." For proof of his position he points to Acts, 22: 16. He also says: "The bread is *really* transmuted into the body of Christ." In proof of this he appeals to 1 Cor., 11: 24. He interprets both of these texts, as Dean Stanley would say, "mechanically." The teacher of the Current Reformation, however, says: "Baptism washes away our sins, but the bread is not the body of the Lord." He interprets one text "mechanically," but is unwilling to interpret the other in the same way. Is he consistent? The words, "*This is my body*," are certainly as emphatic as the admonition given to Saul of Tarsus: "Be baptized and wash away thy sins." Now, thoughtful reader, who is more consistent, the Papist or the Reformer?

But the Master has commanded us to be baptized. Is not this enough? Do we need other reasons to make us submit? The word of Jesus surely is enough for the loving heart.

But to be more minute: Baptism presents to the senses a most beautiful and impressive illustration of some of the sublimest truths of the Gospel. We symbolize—

1. Our individual deadness to sin. Rom., 6: 3-4-11. Burial belongs only to the dead. Baptism is a burial.

2. Newness of life. Rom., 6: 4.

"Plunging under water represents death, and arising out of it, the resurrection to a new life."—Lange.

3. Our cordial faith in the fundamental truths of the Gospel—the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. Rom., 6: 3-4.

4. Remission of sins. Acts, 2: 38, 22: 16.

5. Submission and devotion to Christ. Gal., 3 : 27.

6. Hope of the resurrection of the just. 1 Cor.,  
15 : 29.

“Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible,  
the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and  
ever. Amen.”

---

“Ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.”—Jude, 3.

---