

Aphesis Amartion.

THE BAPTISM OF REPENTANCE

FOR

THE REMISSION OF SINS.

Preaching the Baptism of Repentance for the Remission of Sins.—*Luke 3: 3.*

8860

*Nathaniel
Mason* BY
N. M. CRAWFORD,

MERCER UNIVERSITY,
GEORGIA.

SOUTHERN BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY
2225 LEXINGTON ROAD LOUISVILLE, KY.

NASHVILLE, TENN.
SOUTH WESTERN PUBLISHING HOUSE.
BY GRAVES, MARKS & RUTLAND.

1855.

C O N T E N T S .

STATEMENT OF THE SUBJECT. - - -	Page 3
I. Whether forgiveness and remission be the same or not, and whether forgiveness of the sinner and remission of his sin are coetaneous. - - / - - - - -	4
Usus loquendi of pardon, forgive, remit.	4
“ <i>Aphiami.</i> - - -	12
“ <i>Aphcsis.</i> - - -	21
II. Contingency on which pardon, forgiveness and remission occur. Salvation consists in forgiveness of sins - - -	25
Forgiveness obtained through faith.	28
Forgiveness obtained through repentance.	30
<i>Aphesis amartioon.</i> - - -	31
<i>Aphesis</i> in connection with baptism.	36
Repentance for the remission of sins.	38
Baptism and its effects. - - -	42
The Baptismal Formula. - - -	43
Baptism for the remission of sins. -	54
Recapitulation. - - - - -	57
The great duty of man—obedience. -	59

26571
289a

8360

REMISSION OF SINS.

An exegesis of the phrase—ἀφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν.

THE word *remission* is used in the English version of the New Testament *ten times*; *nine times* as a translation for *aphesis*, and once viz: Rom. 3: 25, for *paresis*. *Once*, viz: Luke 1: 77, it is used in connection with *amartia* and the personal pronoun *remission of their sins*. *Six times* in connection with sin without a personal pronoun—*remission of sins*, viz: Mat. 26: 28, Mark 1: 4, Luke 3: 3, 24: 47, Acts 2: 38, 10: 43. *Twice* it is used absolutely, viz: Heb. 9: 22, 10: 18. Besides these nine, the word *aphesis* occurs in the Greek Testament in *eight* other places. In Mark 3: 29, it is used absolutely, and is rendered *forgiveness*. In Acts 5: 31, 13: 38, 26: 18, Eph. 2: 7, Col. 1: 14, it is used in connection with sin, and in reference to persons *forgiveness of sins*. In Luke 4: 18, it occurs *twice*, and is translated, in the first instance, *deliverance*, and in the second, *liberty*. This table shows that *aphesis* is found in the New Testament *seventeen times*, and *nine times* translated *remission*, *six times* *forgiveness*, *once* *deliverance*, and *once* *liberty*.

We design to enquire whether there is any difference between the forgiveness of sin and the forgiveness of sin. Whether the forgive-

46645

234.5

CRCA

RESTRICTED

AREA

ness, or pardon, of the sinner is cotemporaneous with the forgiveness or remission of sin. And upon what contingency the pardon of the sinner, and the remission of his sins occur; or, more particularly, whether the pardon of the sinner and the remission of his sins take place coetaneously upon repentance, or separately—the first upon repentance, and the second upon baptism.

I. What difference, if any, exists between forgiveness of sin, and remission of sin, and whether the forgiveness of the sinner is coetaneous with the remission of his sin?

We shall first ascertain the *usus loquendi* of the words *pardon*, *forgiveness*, and *remission*, in English. To aid us in this investigation, we will quote the definitions of the words from Webster's Dictionary unabridged.

“PARDON v. t. [Latin *per and dono* to give; *per* having the sense of the English *for* in forgive, and *re* in Latin, remit, properly, to give back or away.]

1. To forgive, to remit, as an offence, or crime. *Guilt* implies a being bound or subjected to censure, penalty, or punishment. To *pardon* is to give up this obligation, and release the offender. We apply the word to the crime, or to the person. We *pardon* the offence when we remove it from the offender, and consider him as not guilty: we *pardon* the offender when we release or absolve him from his liability to suffer punishment—I pray thee pardon my sin, 1 Sam. 15: 25. 2. To remit as a penalty. I pardon thee thy life before thou ask it.—Shak. 3. To excuse as a fault.

PARDON, n. Forgiveness: the release of an offender, or of the obligation of the offender to suffer a penalty, or to bear the displeasure of the offended party. We seek the *pardon* of sins, transgressions and offences. 2. Remission of a penalty. An amnesty is a general pardon. 3. Forgiveness received.

FORGIVE, v. t. [*for* and *give*. Goth. *fragiban*, Ger. *vergeben*, D. *vergeeven*, Swedish, *tilgifra*. The sense is to give from, that is, away, as we see by the Gothic *fra*, *from*. The English *for*, and G. and D. *ver*, are the same word, or from the same root; *ver* is the Eng. *far*. The Sw. *til* signifies *to*, and in the compound it signifies toward or back; as in L. *remitto*.]

1. To pardon; to remit as an offence or debt; to overlook an offence and treat the offender as not guilty. The original and proper phrase is to *forgive the offence*, to send it away, to reject it, that is not to *impute it* [put it to] the offender. But by an easy transition we also use the phrase to *forgive the person* offending. Forgive us our debts.—Lord's Prayer. If ye forgive men their trespasses, your Heavenly Father will also forgive you.—Mat. 6: 14. As savages never forget a favor, so they never forgive an injury.—N. Chipman. It is to be noted that *pardon*, like *forgive*, may be followed by the name or person, and by the offence; but remit can be followed by the offence only. We forgive or pardon the man, but we do not *remit* him. 2. To remit, as a debt, fine or penalty.

FORGIVENESS, n. The act of forgiving; the

pardon of an offender, by which he is considered and treated as not guilty. The *forgiveness* of enemies is a christian duty. 2. The pardon or remission of an offence or crime, as the *forgiveness* of sins or injuries.

1. To relax, as intensity; to make less tense or violent. 2. To forgive; to surrender the right of punishing a crime, as to *remit* punishment. 3. To pardon, as a fault or crime. Whatsoever ye *remit*, they are remitted unto them.

REMISSION. n. [We omit several of the definitions as not relevant to this investigation.]

1. Abatement: relaxation, moderation, as the remission of extreme rigor. 5. Forgiveness; pardon; that is, the giving up the punishment due to a crime; as the *remission* of sins—Mat. 26, Heb. 9.”

We will now look at the import of these words, as they are distinguished from each other, and as they coincide in meaning.

PARDON and FORGIVE both have reference, primarily, to the offence; and, secondarily, to the offender. Either is applied, therefore, to the offence or thing, and to the offender or person. We pardon or forgive the offender; we pardon or forgive the offence. *Pardon* is used in reference to crime, and is, therefore, appropriate to governments; but it is not exclusively so used, for nothing is more common than for individuals to ask pardon for minor offences, intentional or unintentional. The legal act which absolves the criminal from punishment is called pardon. Forgiveness is appropriate to debts. We forgive the debtor,

(not pardon him,) whether the creditor be a government or an individual. Yet forgiveness is not limited to pecuniary transactions, (as debt is not,) but extends to all personal injuries or offences, and is even applicable to an individual who receives a legal pardon. It is evident that wherever pardon or forgiveness is applicable, three things are involved: first, a party offended; second, a party offending; third, the act of offence. It is impossible to conceive of pardon or forgiveness, without having reference to these three ideas. Hence, the verbs pardon and forgive must have two objects, and cannot be fully understood unless both are expressed or implied.

If I say, "I teach John," the question arises, "What do you teach?" If I say, "I teach grammar," the question arises, "Whom do you teach?" But when I say, "I teach John grammar," the sense is complete, because the verb is followed by both objects, the person and the thing taught.

In like manner, the verbs pardon and forgive, to make complete sense, must be followed by two objects, the person, or offender, and the thing, or offence. Thus, Mat. 18: 27, "forgave him the debt," verse 34, "I forgave thee all that debt," verse 35, "If ye from your heart forgive not every one his brother their trespasses." The personal object of the verb is frequently implied by the possessive case in connection with the offence, as in the language of Saul to Samuel, quoted by Webster, "I pray thee pardon my sin," 1 Sam. 15: 25. It is the person, unquestionably,

that is the "object or subject of clemency,"* in every case of pardon or forgiveness. No one supposes anything else. The party offending receives the benefit, when "we pardon the offence;" to use Webster's language, that is, "when we remove it (the offence) from the offender, and consider him as not guilty," just as fully and clearly as he receives the benefit when "we pardon the offender," that is, (to quote Webster again) "when we release or absolve him from the liability to suffer punishment."

In every case of pardon or forgiveness, it is evident that the offender is released, and that the obligation under which he lay to suffer censure, penalty or punishment is given up. There can be no pardon or forgiveness till the offender is released; there can be no pardon or forgiveness till the liability to suffer punishment is given up. The two things always concur in fact, and co-exist in time. To say that a criminal is pardoned, and is yet subject to punishment, is a contradiction in terms.

As God is the Supreme Ruler of the universe, He pardons offences against His law and government; as He is our Father, He forgives our offences against Himself; and as every offence against him, personally, is an offence against his government, *vice versa*, it is equally proper to say, that God pardons, or God forgives the sinner, or the sin.

We will now consider the peculiar meaning and force of REMIT.

* W. C. B., in Tennessee Baptist, June 17, 1854.

Its object is not the person, but the thing—the offence, not the offender. As Webster says, “*Pardon, like forgive* may be followed by the name or person, and by the offence, but *remit* can be followed by the offence only. We forgive or pardon the man, but we do not *remit* him.” We remit the offence; we remit the punishment due to the offence. But we no more do this *abstractly*, than we *pardon* or *forgive* abstractly. In every case of *remission* there must be understood an offending person whose liability is removed. *Remit* appears to be only more limited in its application than the other two words, but as far as it is applied, its signification is similar. When I say, “John’s sin is pardoned or forgiven,” what other meaning is conveyed than that which is understood, when I say, “John’s sin is remitted?” Anything more? Anything less? Anything else? Clearly not. In each case the liability to punishment is removed; and so far as the guilt of the party is concerned, he is as he was before the commission of the offence. I certainly do not forgive an offender until I remit his offence, and give back all obligations consequent upon it; and whenever I do thus remit the offence, I do forgive the offender.

The fundamental error, we think, into which W. C. B. has fallen, is in the supposition that remission is not the act of releasing, but the *declaration* of that act. He says:—“The sinner being pardoned, justice and the law require that his sins be remitted—that is, ‘sent back’ from him—ceased to be charged against him—and he, by proper *process* of

law, declared to be free from any penalty. The remission of his sins does not give him a right to freedom from the arrest of the law; the act of pardon alone gives him that right; and remission is only the process of law by which his title to liberty is avouched, or made known."—*Tenn. Rep.*, June 17, 1854.

Now for the meaning of remission, to wit: the *declaration*, or, if you please, the legal declaration of the release of the criminal as distinguished from the act of pardon, there is no authority in the *usus loquendi* of the English language. Neither Webster, nor Crabb, nor any other lexicographer, nor philologist supports it. It is original with W. C. B., and the standard writers of the language are against him. Websters definition of *remit* is "to forgive," not *not to declare or avouch forgiveness already granted*; "to surrender the right of punishing a crime," not *to declare that the right is surrendered*. His meaning, unquestionably, is that to *remit* is to *constitute the offender a pardoned sinner*, not simply to *declare him pardoned*.

We have said that *remit* is more limited in its application than *pardon* and *forgive*. This remark, however, is made with reference to its application to offences and offenders; for, taking the whole range of its use, *remit* is more general. Pardon and forgive refer exclusively to offences and offenders. Remit has no special limitation. We can, therefore, use *remit* and *remission* in many cases where the use of *pardon* and *forgive* would be absurd.

So in the passage of Milton quoted by Webster:

“So willingly doth God remit his ire.”

It would be nonsense to substitute *pardon* or *forgive*. On the other hand, there are instances in which the three words may be used differently. The *primary* meaning of *pardon* and *forgive* (according to Webster, who unquestionably is right) has reference to the offence; a secondary meaning of *remit*, also, has reference to the same. We may, therefore, at choice say, I pardon, forgive, or remit the offence—offence being equally the object of the three verbs, with similar force of meaning. On the contrary, *pardon* and *forgive* have acquired a secondary meaning with reference to the offender, which *remit* has not acquired. While, therefore, I may properly say, I pardon, or forgive the offender, (the offender being the object of the verb,) I can not use *remit* in the same way, usage not allowing the *person*, but only the crime, or thing to be the object of this verb.

Having shown the *usus loquendi* of the English, we proceed to consider the Greek words involved in the question.

We have seen that *aphesis* occurs in the New Testament seventeen times; nine times translated remission; six times, forgiveness; once, deliverance; and once liberty.

Aphesis is thus defined by Liddel and Scott: “A letting go, freeing, e. g. of a slave or captive; a discharge from the obligations of a bond; a dismissal, divorce, a letting go [*Lat.*

missio] of horses at the starting point; the opening of barriers and sluices; remission forgiveness." This is the classical use of the word and it will be seen that, unlike remission in English, it is spoken of persons as well as things.

Robinson, in his N. T. Lexicon, defines it as follows: "A letting go, a freeing, e. g. 1. Of persons from bondage, or service, deliverance liberty. 2. From the guilt and consequence of sin, remission, forgiveness, pardon. So from debt, punishment.

Aphesis is derived from the verb, *aphiami*, compounded of *apo* from, and *iami*, [radical signification, to set agoing,] to send to send away to let go, especially of living beings.—L. & S. 's Lex

Aphiami is defined by the same lexicographers:

1. "To send forth, discharge, as missiles; in prose, to send forth on an expedition, send out, despatch.

11. To send away, to let go—*tina*; hence, to throw away, get rid of. 2. To let go, loose, set free—*zoon, tina, aph.* Hom. [to let him go alive.] Hence, with the accusative of person, and genitive of thing, to set free from a thing, let off from, especially from an engagement, accusation, &c. *Aph. tina phonou sunalagmatoon, egklamatoon leitourgoon*, [murder, contracts, accusation, service,]; but, also, with dative of person, and accusative of thing—*aph tina aitian*, to remit one a charge; absolutely *aph tina*, to acquit. 3. To let go, dissolve, disband, break up. 5. To put away, divorce. 5. To let go, as an *aphetos*, consecrate.

III. To give up, hand over; hence—2. With accus., of thing, to give up, leave off, let alone.

3. With infin., to give up.

IV. To let suffer, permit one to do a thing.

V. Secmingly intr. break up march, sail, [according to the word implied by the context.]

B. In middle voice, to send forth from one's self. 2. To loose one's self from."

We have preferred to give in full the definitions, that the reader might see without referring to the lexicon, the judgement of the lexicographers as to the meaning of the word in question; and because it is used in the New Testament in most of the senses given. It will be seen that *aphiami* is followed by the accusative of the person, which remit never is.

The primary meaning of *aphiami* is, unquestionably, to send forth, to send away. It essentially involves the idea of *removal* or *separation*, and primarily refers to material objects. Like many other verbs, it is secondarily applied to immaterial things, and by the use of speech, suggests as readily the latter as the former. Our purpose is to consider exclusively its application to offences and offenders.

By the figurative use of speech, offences, with their consequences, guilt, punishment, &c., are considered as a burden resting upon and bearing down the perpetrator. So, also, accusations and complaints which imply guilt and censure. In such cases, to relieve the man there must be a *separation*, a *removal*, as regards the person, and the burden resting upon him. The man is said to be removed from the punishment or charge. We let him go,

let him off, set him free from the accusation and the punishment. He is acquitted, forgiven, or pardoned. So in the instances cited by the lexicon, *aphienai tina phonon*, to let him off from murder. So, also, Kuhner, *aph. tina aitas*, to let him off from the charge. So in Demosthenes, "If the wounded man before his death shall dismiss or excuse the author of his death [*apha tou phonou ton drasanta*] none of his relations shall be permitted to prosecute him, but those whom the laws command when convicted to be cast out, and exiled, and even put to death, if they are thus dismissed or accused [*aphethoosin*] are entirely freed from punishment by this single word." The murdered man is represented as releasing the murderer, and his relations are prohibited from accusing him. Those who are thus released are freed from all the penal consequences of their crime. A person, viz: the wrong-doer, is the object of the verb in the active voice. A person, viz: the wrong-doer, is the subject of the verb in the passive voice. In both instances, he is freed from the offence. The usage of remit is different. We do not remit the wrong-doer: he cannot be remitted.

Again, by a similar use of figurative language, on the commission of a crime or offence, the right of exacting redress or punishment attaches to the injured party, which redress or punishment the offender is bound to pay or suffer. The injured party may forego this right. There is then, a separation between him and his right, a removal of his right from himself by his voluntary surrender. He gives

back to the offender the obligation which bound him. He gives up the redress or punishment which he may justly claim, and sends back to the offender the obligation he had incurred. So *aphienai tini aitian*, to remit to one a charge, the accusative of the thing given up, with the dative of the person to whom it is surrendered. Conversely in the passive voice, the crime or offence, or its punishment, becomes the nominative or subject of the verb, while the person or offender continues in the dative, as Matt. 9: 2—*apheoontai soi ai amartiai*—thy sins be forgiven thee. Analogous to this, in the use, in English, of pardon, forgive and remit.

This, then, appears to be the proper use of *aphiami* in respect to offences and offenders. When the idea most prominent in the mind of the speaker, is the condition of the offender, blessed in being released from the just consequences of his crime, the person [criminal] is the object of the active voice in the accusative, or the subject of the passive voice in the nominative. On the other hand, when the prerogative of the offended party, to punish or to pardon, is the prominent idea, the thing [offence or punishment] is the object of the active voice, or the subject of the passive voice. An instance of the first, is Gen. 16: 26—If I find in Sodom fifty righteous within the city, I will spare all the city for their sakes—*aphasoo 'olan polin tan kai' olan ton topon*. The prominent idea is the condition of the city. Corresponding is the question which drew from the Almighty the answer, verse 24—Wilt thou not

spare the place?—*ouk anaseis ton topon*.—The prerogative of Jehovah to punish, or to pardon, is considered only as incidental to the condition in which it might place the guilty city.

Similar is the passage, Gen. 4: 12, (13,) rendered in our version: My punishment is greater than I can bear. In the Greek: *Meizoon a aitia mou tou aphethanai me*—My guilt is too great for me to be pardoned. Here Cain considers most prominently his own condition. Jehovah's prerogative is, in his mind, only incidental to the prominent idea.

Otherwise, in Gen. 50: 17, Forgive the trespass of thy brethren and their sin—*Aphes autois tan adikian kai tan amartian*. The sons of Jacob remembered their cruel injury, and dreaded the existence of a vindictive spirit in their brother, now governor of Egypt, and as they knew he had the entire control of their lives and fortunes, the prominent idea in their mind was, his power to punish and the probability of its exercise.

In both the Old and New Testaments, where *aphiami* is used in reference to the exercise of God's mercy to the sinner, the prominent idea is, the divine prerogative of pardon. The sinner who repents and believes, rejoices "in hope of the glory of God," and the sense of his own happiness is subordinate to the higher excellency of the God of his salvation. Indeed, this is ever the prominent idea where God's pardoning attribute is considered. In accordance with this fact, and the principles before laid down, *aphiami* is used in reference

to the forgiveness of the offenders and offences.

Aphiami, however, is sometimes used with only the person expressed; sometimes with only the thing. An instance of the former is Mat. 18: 21, How often shall my brother sin against me and I forgive him—*aphasoo autoo*. So, also, Luke 16: 4, If he repent, forgive him—*aphes autoo*, and Luke 23: 34, Forgive them (*aphes autois*) for they know not what they do. An instance of the latter is Joseph, Ant. 6: 5, 6, *Toutan aphiami tan amartian*—remit, pardon, forgive the sin.

These exceptions, however, are rather formal than real, inasmuch as in every case where there is an offender, there is, also, an offence, and *vice versa*; and the expression of either conveys an implication of the other.

Aphiami is sometimes used absolutely, followed by neither person nor thing, as in Mark 11: 25, 26; but then the context evidently shows that both are implied.

As our object is to ascertain the *usus loquendi* of the Greek word, and as the classic authors, the Septuagint and the New Testament enable us to do it most fully, we deem it unnecessary to go into any detail in investigating the Hebrew words for which *aphiami* is used by the seventy. The word forgive is found in the English version as the translation of the Hebrew words, *Salahh, Nasa, Kaphar*.

Very little uniformity is observed in the Greek rendering of either of these words by the seventy; *perhaps*, because different writers may have translated different books of the

Old Testament without establishing uniform principles of translation. In illustration of this statement we will mention a few instances :

Salahh, three times in the book of Numbers, is translated forgive, and is followed by the dative of the person. Num. 30: 5, 8, 12, in each instance, the seventy render *Kathairete autan* a clear mistranslation.

In 1 Kings, 8 ch., it occurs five times, and in 2 Chr. 6 and 7 ch., six times—in every case translated, forgive—sometimes being followed by the dative of the person, sometimes by the dative of the thing, and sometimes it is used absolutely. In all these instances, the verb is *in Kal*, and the seventy render it *ilasa* or *ileeos esa*.

In Lev. it is sometimes translated forgive ; in these instances the verb is *in Niphal*, and is rendered by the seventy, *aphethasetai*, followed by the dative of the person.

It is unnecessary to go farther into these details. The primary idea of *Salahh*, like *Sala* and *Nasa*, to which it is nearly related, and *Nasa*, to which it is analogous, is that of lifting up, taking away. It is used only in *Kal* and *Niphal*. In the former (active) the person forgiving is the subject of the verb, which is followed by the dative of the crime, as Ex. 34 : 9, or by the dative of the person, as Num. 30 : 6 ; or it is used absolutely, as 1 Ki. 8 : 30. Once it is followed by both person and thing, Jer. 5 : 7: How shall I pardon thee for this.

The circumstance of the crime being used in connection with the genitive of the person,

proves nothing ; for we have before shown that in every act of forgiveness, both a crime and a criminal must be implied. This is the case even where the verb is used absolutely, as in Isa. 55: 7: "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the LORD, and he will have mercy upon him: to our God, for he will abundantly *pardon*." Pardon what?—Pardon whom? The wicked man his way; and the unrighteous man his thoughts, unquestionably.

There are, however, at least three instances in which the Hebrew verb, forgive, is followed by the crime alone, without any person: Ex. 34: 7—forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin; Num. 14: 18—The Lord is of long-suffering, and of great mercy, forgiving iniquity and transgression; Mic. 7: 18—Who is a God like unto thee that *pardoneth iniquity*. The Hebrew verb is *Nasa*.

In reference to *aphiami*, with which we are particularly concerned, we have seen that it is followed by the person, (Gen. 18: 26,) or by the thing. In this it is analogous to the English words *forgive* and *pardon*. When used in the passive voice, the crime is the subject of the verb which is followed by the person. So, too, we say, "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted (forgiven, pardoned) unto them." That it is entirely analogous to forgive, when used in reference to offences, will further appear by comparing its New Testament usage with that of *karizomai*.

Mat. 6: 12: Forgive us our debts—*aphes*

amin ta ophailamata. 2 Cor. 12: 13: Forgive me this wrong—*charisasthe moi tan adikian tautan.* Each verb followed by the dative of the person as the secondary object, and the accusative of the thing as the prime object. The reader will remember the remark of Webster: “The original and proper phrase is to forgive the offence, to send it away, reject it, not to *impute* it (put it to) the offender.” Similar to the passages just quoted, are Mat. 6: 14, 15, and 18: 32—*aphiami*, and 2 Cor. 10, and Col. 2: 13—*charizomai*—and other places.

Mat. 18: 21: How oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him—*aphesoo autoo.* Luke 7: 32: He frankly forgave them both—*amphoterois echarisato*—both followed by the dative of the person. So, also, Mat. 6: 12, 14, Luke 11: 4, Eph. 4: 32, and Col. 3: 13.

If still additional proof is required that *aphiami* refers to the actual bestowing of forgiveness, and not its mere declaration, it will be found in the fact, that every prayer to God for forgiveness, and every assurance of Christ in the New Testament, that forgiveness of sin can be bestowed, uses this word, or its derivative, *aphesis*. If *aphiami* does not mean to *forgive*, there is no promise of forgiveness in the gospel. The only exceptions that can be stated to this remark are, Col. 3: 13: Even as Christ forgave you: where *charizomai* is used; and Luke 6: 37: forgive and ye shall be forgiven—*apoluo*. That the reader may verify this remark, we append a list of references:

Mat. 6: 12, 14, 55; 9: 2, 5; 12: 31, 32; 18: 35.

Mark 2: 5, 7, 9, 10 : 3: 28; 4: 12; 11: 25, 26.

Luke 5: 20, 21, 23, 24; 7: 47, 48, 49; 11: 4; 23: 34.

Acts 8: 22.

James 5: 15.

1 John 1: 9; 2: 12.

If these passages refer merely to a declaration of forgiveness already granted, is it not most astonishing that nothing should be said of actual forgiveness itself?

Aphesis corresponds in meaning with *aphiammi*, from which it is derived, and, unlike *remission*, it is used in reference to both things and persons.

In the year of Jubilee, servants were released, debts given up, and lands restored to their original owners: Lev. 25 20: And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year and proclaim liberty (*aphesis*) throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a *jubilee* unto you, [*samasia apheseoos*, giving a signal, or sign of release,] and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man to his family. That *aphesis*, like *aphiammi*, is of more general application than forgiveness, pardon, or remission, is evident. It is used when the captive is released, the slave emancipated, the debtor discharged, and lands restored to their owner. In the proclamation of the Jubilee, *aphesis* applies to all these; neither forgiveness, nor pardon, nor remission, nor *liberty even*, can cover the entire ground. It is only when applied to offences that it has the special meaning of forgiveness

or remission. This will sufficiently show the irrelevance of W. C. B.'s criticism of Jer. 34 : 17, which he quotes "to show the absurdity of construing *aphesis* as an equivalent to pardon or forgive," for a substitution of remission in that passage for *aphesis* will be just as absurd. "Ye have not hearkened unto me in proclaiming remission every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbor; behold I proclaim remission for you, saith the Lord, to the sword, to the pestilence, and to the famine," &c.

The use of *aphesis* in the New Testament is in entire accordance with the views of forgiveness, which we have expressed, and confirmed by the usage of *aphiamai* (as will more fully appear in the sequel) and includes both remission of the sin and the pardon of the sinner as coetaneous acts, or parts, or phases of the same act.

Heb. 9 : 22 : "And almost all things are by the law *purged* with blood, and without shedding of blood there is no remission" *aphesis*. The purification and remission take place at the same time.

Heb. 10 : 16-18 : "This is the covenant that I will make with them. After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now, where remission of these is, *aphesis tautoon*, there is no more offering for sin." The quotation is from Jer. 31 : 31, 33, 34, which is more full and explicit :— "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that

I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah ; * * * * this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts ; and I will be their God and they shall be my people.— * * * * For I will forgive their iniquity [Gr. *lneos*, Heb. *Sala*] and I will remember their sin no more." Here Jehovah announces his new covenant in which His adoption of His people is coetaneous with his writing his law in their hearts, with his forgiving their iniquities and ceasing to remember their sins, and the Apostle's explanation is, that in these facts consists the remission of sins ; *aphesis*, therefore, must occur with the actual bestowal of God's pardoning mercy, and cannot be simply the future announcement of a blessing already enjoyed.

Other passages occur, in which *aphesis* unquestionably must involve the idea of forgiveness of the sinner, and exclude the idea of mere declaration of a preceding act of pardon, as Col. 1 : 14—In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins—*tan aphisin toon amartioon*. While speaking of the redemption by the blood of Jesus, it is surely tame to lower the idea to a mere publication of a pardon already enjoyed. So in Eph. 1 : 7—In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace. So in other passages quoted by JUNIUS in the Tennessee Baptist. Luke 24 : 47 ; Acts 5 : 31 ; 10 : 43,

13 : 38, 26 ; 18. The same is true of Matt. 26 : 28—This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins—*aphesin amartioon*. If the blood of Christ is shed simply for a declaration of a preceding pardon, on what does that pardon depend ? Whence is it obtained ? How procured ? Who is its author ? How is Jesus shorn of his glory, simply to declare a pardon which already existed, procured by some other means ? But we are assured that “the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin”—1 John 1 : 7 ; surely then, it is that blood which actually removes the guilt, and not merely declares its removal, from the sinner.

These passages suffice to show that the mind of the Spirit, in using the phrase *aphesin amartioon*, was to convey the idea of an actual forgiveness of the sinner, and not the mere legal declaration of a pardon already procured from some other source and in some other manner. If this be so, it is a simple question of English criticism, whether, in translating, we shall use the word forgiveness or remission. If the *usus loquendi* of these words has been accurately defined, either will sufficiently express the meaning of the original, but we should prefer the former, as its primary and prominent signification conveys the idea intended.

We close this part of the discussion, by quoting a canon of interpretation, which all will admit to be correct, and applicable to the questions under consideration. Professor Stu-

art lays it down "That it is a safe rule, not to adopt the sense of a word which is not supported by the *usus loquendi*, when another meaning which is supported by it, can be given, which will make good sense."—Com. on Rom. chap. 1, ver. 5—*aphiami* and *aphesis*—both are shown by the *usus loquendi* to express the actual forgiveness of the offender and of the offence; *neither* is thus shown to express the mere announcement of forgiveness already granted. Nor is there in the etymology of the words any thing to countenance the idea that the words may have such a meaning.

We are, therefore, led to the conclusion that no difference exists between the forgiveness of sin and the remission of sin, and that the forgiveness of the sinner and the remission or forgiveness of his sins are coetaneous events. This conclusion, we think, will be further confirmed by the discussion of the question, upon what contingency the forgiveness of the sinner occurs.

II. Upon what contingency do the pardon of the sinner and the forgiveness or remission of his sins occur? Or, more particularly, do they occur simultaneously upon repentance, or separately, the first upon repentance and the second upon baptism?

For the solution of these questions we are driven, of course, to the *lex scripta* of the Gospel. "What is written in the law? what readest thou?"

The first announcement of salvation contained in the New Testament is in the prophetic address of Zacharias, when his tongue was

loosed and he "was filled with the Holy Ghost." "Thou, child, shalt be called the Prophet of the Highest: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways; to give knowledge of salvation unto his people by [*en, in*] the remission of their sins" Luke 1: 17—*en aphesei amartioon autoon*. The salvation consists in the actual forgiveness of sins, for without this there could be no salvation, nor any announcement of pardon bestowed. Says Alford: "The remission of sin is the first opening for the *gnoesis sootarias* [knowledge of salvation.] The preposition *en* has its literal meaning "in." Rosenmuller says: "*Possunt etiam haec verba referri ad sootarias, ut sensus sit: quæ salus est in remissione peccatorum.*" These words may also be referred to *sootarias*, so that the sense may be *which salvation consists in the remission of sins*. So Gill: "It (salvation) follows *by the remission of sins*: the sense of which is, either that salvation is by the forgiveness of sin, and lies in it, that being the principal part of it. [See Eph. 1: 7] Sins are debts; forgiving them is a remitting these debts, a loosing them, or the obligation to payment which is done freely or fully, for Christ's sake and through his blood; and herein lies the blessedness and salvation of men. Or else that the knowledge of salvation was conveyed through the ministry of John, not by preaching the works of the law, but the doctrine of the remission of sins by Christ, (Mark 1: 4, John 1: 29) and which is the *sum and substance of the Gospel*, as it was ordered to be preached by Christ and was preached by his apostles."

The reader will perceive that Gill's view of remission and forgiveness is identical with that which we have set forth, and involves a great deal more than the mere announcement that a pardoned sinner has been heretofore pardoned. It is, indeed, *the sum and substance of the Gospel*. We cannot refrain from quoting the excellent comment of Olshausen :

“The knowledge of salvation is specified as the end of his (John's) preparatory labors.—The Lord himself gives the salvation, (ver. 7) John awakens to an insight into its necessity. * * * There can be no doubt how the following clause, ‘by the remission of sins,’ should be connected. The salvation itself consists in this, and as a divine act it can proceed only from God. It is best, therefore, to complete the phrase, *sootarias en aphesei ousas, salvation consisting in remission of sins*. The forgiveness of sin appears here, consequently, as the great prerogative of the times of the Messiah, which was lacking to the Old Testament economy. The sacrifices of the Old Covenant could not effect an *inward essential remission*, but merely a ‘purifying of the flesh,’ (Heb. 9: 13,) inasmuch as they restored the interrupted relations with the Old Testament theocracy. Sin itself remained through the forbearance of God. But in the New Testament *essential forgiveness* was bestowed; on the one hand, by the *actual removal of the consequences of sin*; on the other, by the *actual implanting of a new, higher life of holiness and righteousness*.”*

* We have in these extracts marked some phrases in *italics* not in the original.

This is admirable and worthy of all acceptance. The *aphesis* which is the *essential forgiveness* in which salvation consists is imparted when it may be said in respect to the sinner, "Blessed is he whose iniquities are forgiven and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin," (Rom. 4: 7, 8,) that is (Paul being the teacher) the man who is justified by faith without the works of the law.

The first individual case of the forgiveness of a sinner is that of the palsied man: Mat. 9: 5, Mark 2: 5, Luke 5: 20, &c. And Jesus seeing their faith said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee. *Apheontai soi ai amartiai sou*, as Geo. Campbell, of Aberdeen, translates, "thy sins are forgiven thee." Did the Scribes and Pharisees understand Jesus simply to announce the fact that the man had been forgiven, or to claim for himself the prerogative of actually forgiving him? They murmured, "Who is this that speaketh blasphemies?—Who can forgive sins but God only?" *Aphienai amartias*. If the phrase means the actual forgiveness, certainly none but God; if it means only the legal announcement of the fact, as W. C. B. contends, any authorized minister of the law can do it, and there is no blasphemy in the matter. If baptism be the "divinely appointed process of law," for this purpose, the administrator does exercise the power (*aphienai amartias*) to forgive or remit sins. Jesus Christ entertained a different view. He admits the premises of his opponents,

“None but God can forgive sin,” and shows the falsity of their conclusion, by proving that He, the Son of man, possessed the power of God, “That ye may know that the Son of man hath power to forgive sins, (*aph. amartias*,) then saith he to the sick of the palsy, Arise, take up thy bed and go unto thy house. And he arose and went to his house.” The Savior by performing a visible miracle, involving the exercise of Divine power, proves that the power of God was his, the power asserted in this case of actually bestowing forgiveness. And what was it which produced the exercise of this power? What was the contingency on which it depended? *Faith*. “When he saw their faith.”

Another instance of the actual forgiveness of sins is recorded, Luke 7: 36–50, in the case of the woman who anointed Jesus. In reply to the thought of the Pharisee, Jesus relates the parable of the two debtors whose debts the creditor forgave, (*echarisato*,)—actual forgiveness, not a mere declaration of it. He then applies the case to a sinful woman. He recounts her tears, her kisses, and the anointing of his feet, evidences of her love. Wherefore (he concludes) her sins, which are many, are forgiven, and he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven. *Aph. eoontai amartiai*, equivalent to *echarisato* in the forty-second verse, and unquestionably referring to her actual pardon, which was the ground of her love. Upon what was the forgiveness in this case based? Let the Savior answer. “He said unto the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee;

go in peace." Here we have once more forgiveness of the sinner, and forgiveness or remission of the sin, concurrent events, based upon the same cause, and that the faith of the sinner.

Faith and repentance are different acts, but they always coexist. The believer is always one who repents. The sinner, who repents, also believes. The blessings of salvation are promised, therefore, sometimes upon repentance and sometimes on faith, as regard is more especially had to the reformation of heart and life implied in the first; or to the vital principle which produces the change in the second. Hence the exhortation is sometimes to *repent and believe*, (Mark 1: 15,) sometimes simply to *repent*, (Mark 6: 12,) sometimes simply to *believe*, (Jno. 14: 1.) To prove that there is no discrepancy in these exhortations needs no argument. We have seen *faith* exhibited as the contingency on which forgiveness of sins is obtained. We shall now see that repentance, the concomitant of faith is also exhibited as the contingency for obtaining forgiveness.

We are taught this in Luke 17: 3, 4, If thy brother trespass against thee rebuke him; and if he repent forgive him, *aphes autoo*, and if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him, *aphaseis autoo*. Surely we are here commanded actually to forgive, and the repentance of the brother is the contingency upon which we are to act. So, also Peter directed Simon to turn

to God—Acts 8: 22. *Repent*, therefore, of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if, perhaps, the thought of thy heart may be *forgiven* thee: *aphethasetai*. Is not this *repentance* and the *actual forgiveness* of the sin with no intervening process, and nothing like a legal announcement of the pardon separate and distinct from its actual bestowal? Similar is the preaching of the same great Apostle: Acts 3: 19: Repent ye therefore and be converted, that your sins may be *blotted out*: *exaleiphthanai*. The phrase here is different, but the idea is the same, furnishing an illustration of the wide range of figurative language as applied to the subject under discussion. The same great idea is repeated in still a different form in the last verse of the chapter: “God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities”—the blessing of God contingent upon the repentance of the sinner.

Without enlarging further, we will proceed to show that the use of *aphesis* is entirely accordant with the views just set forth. Peter and the other apostles declared: Acts 5: 31: Him [Jesus] hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Savior, to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins: *aphesin amartion*. Here *aphesis*, whatever it means, is connected immediately with repentance. But we have shown that it means the actual forgiveness of sins, and we will add that any other rendering will be both forced and tame. Similar is the teaching of the Savior after his resurrection: Luke 24: 45, 47:

“When he opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures. And said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead on the third day. And that repentance and remission of sins (*aphesis amartioon*) should be preached in his name among all nations.” *Aphesis*, whatever it means, connected again directly with repentance, and both based upon the name of Jesus. What can we see here, but Christ the cause, repentance the contingency, and forgiveness, actual and real, the result.

Acts 10: 43: To him [Jesus] give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive *remission of sins*. Here, again, we have remission of sins (whatever it be) connected immediately with faith. There is no intervention either of man or ceremony between the two; but Jesus and the sinner, brought to one by faith, and the actual enjoyment of forgiveness bestowed in the union.

Acts 13: 38, 39: “Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man [Jesus] is preached unto you forgiveness of sins, (*aphesis amartioon*,) and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.” Here, again, we have forgiveness of sins proclaimed through Jesus, and justification is by faith without the intervention of man or ceremony.

It is interesting to consider the commission which Paul received directly from the Lord

himself: Acts 26: 16, &c.: "I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of those things which thou has seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee, delivering thee from the people and from the Gentiles unto whom now I send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness unto light and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, (*aphesis amartioon,*) and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me." Paul's commission, therefore, received immediately from the Savior, constituted him a witness of and for Christ; as this witness he was sent not to baptize, but to preach Jesus Christ and him crucified, and the result of his witness should be the illumination of the hearers and their deliverance from the power of Satan, the designed effect of which illumination was, that they should receive forgiveness of sins, and, of course, inheritance among the saints, and *all this* the result of faith in Jesus; for the words, *pistei ta eis eme, by faith on me*, which our English version joins with *agrasmenois* "specify evidently the condition by which believers obtain the pardon of sin and an interest in the heavenly inheritance." Hackett in loc., Kuinoel, Bengel, Bloomfield, Gill, Clarke. Here, in his very call and appointment to the apostleship, Paul is taught that faith in the Son of God is the contingency on which actual pardon is bestowed. There is no intervention of man or ceremony, but faith at once confers forgiveness of sins and a participation in the in-

heritance of saints. This passage is most important. It is the commission of Christ to his new apostle; the great apostle to the heathen. It shows that *aphesis amartioon*, remission of sins and a participation of the inheritance of the saints are inseparably united, and it shows that these are contingent upon the faith of him that believes without the mediation of human beings or the intervention of external ceremony.

Paul's teaching was in entire conformity to this glorious commission. We will omit other passages, and refer to those only in which occurs the phrase under discussion. Writing "to the *saints* and *faithful* brethren in Christ which are in Colosse," he says: "We give thanks to God, and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, praying always for you, since we heard of your faith in Christ Jesus." He adds: "Giving thanks unto the Father, who hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light, who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son; in whom we have redemption thro' his blood, even the *forgiveness of sins: aphasis amartioon*." Col. 1: 12, 14. The coincidence between this passage and the commission of Paul before quoted (Acts 26: 16) and is so striking that we are constrained to believe that the apostle when writing this had a vivid recollection of his interview with the Savior. By that commission Paul was to turn the Gentiles from darkness unto light. Here they are delivered from the power of darkness; there, he was to turn

them from the power of Satan unto God ; here, they are translated into the kingdom of his dear son ; there, they were to receive inheritance among them that are sanctified ; here, they are made meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light ; there, through faith, they were to receive forgiveness of sins, *aphesis amartioon* ; here, through the same faith, they receive redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins. There can be no doubt that *aphesis amartioon*, forgiveness of sins, means the same thing in both passages ; neither can there be any question that, in the latter, it is explanatory of the phrase, redemption through his blood. The same remark is applicable to Eph. 1: 17 : “ In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins ”—*aphesis paraptoomaaton*. That is no redemption which does not forgive and deliver us from our sins. Christ’s blood is the cause of this forgiveness, and the repentance and faith of the sinner the contingency on which it is enjoyed. And in these passages, as elsewhere, every intimation of man or ceremony intervening is negatived. In the exercise of repentance and faith the sinner comes directly to Jesus, and receives immediately from him redemption and forgiveness.

The examination of the preceding passages confirms the position before taken, that *aphesis amartioon* means the actual pardon of sins, and not the mere declaration of pardon already previously bestowed, and that the contingency on which this pardon occurs, is the exercise of

repentance and faith by the sinner. In order to close this discussion, it is now necessary to examine those passages in which *aphesis* is used in connection with baptism.

In Mark 1: 4, we read: "John did baptize in the wilderness and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins"—*Baptisma metanoias eis aphasisin amartioon*. Luke 3: 3, is similar, "He came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins"—*Baptisma metanoias eis aphasisin amartioon*. One other passage occurs, Acts 2: 38: "Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, (*eis aphasisin amartioon*,) and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost." In all these instances *aphesis* is used in connection with the preposition, *eis*. The proper interpretation of this preposition, therefore, becomes important to the correct understanding of these scriptures.

The proper import of *eis* refers to motion and place and its *primary* and most *frequent* signification, is *into*. It is also used *tropically*, as marking the end or purpose to or towards which any thing tends. Thus it is spoken, first, of a result, effect, or consequence, and marks that to which a person or thing tends, becomes, or is made, as Acts 2: 20: The sun shall be turned into darkness, (*eis skotos*,) and the moon into blood, (*eis aima*.) So, also, second, of an intent, purpose, aim, or end, in the sense of *unto*, *in order to*, or *for*, i. e., for the purpose of, for the sake of, on account of, as Luke 22: 19: This

do in remembrance of me, *eis eman enamnasin*. Again, third, as marking the object of any reference, relation, allusion, *unto, into, towards*, i. e., with reference to. Thus it means *in accordance with, conformably to*, as Mat. 10: 41: He that receiveth a prophet *in the name* of a prophet, (*eis onoma*,) i. e. in accordance with the character of a prophet (Mat. 12: 41, Luke 11: 32,) they repented *at the preaching* of Jonas (*eis karurma*) *conformably* to his preaching.—[Robinson's Lex.]

This brief statement of the signification and uses of the preposition is sufficient to show that we must rely largely on the context to determine its meaning in any particular passage where it is tropically used. It is evident also that, in many instances, it is used elliptically, so that to obtain the full sense, another word, and very frequently a verb, must be supplied, as in the passage quoted: This do in remembrance of me: the meaning is not simply that the disciples must observe the supper in consequence of their remembrance but in order to *keep up* a remembrance of their Lord. It is clear too, that *eis* is used in allusion to the *past* events, as well as future results. A careful consideration of the context, the allusions, and the design of the writer is therefore necessary to determine the peculiar force of the preposition wherever it is used.

In two of the passages now under consideration, *baptisma*, and in the third, *baptizo* is used, and these three are particularly insisted upon as proof texts, to show that remission of sins is a consequence of baptism, and essen-

tially and inseparably connected with it. To avoid the force of these passages, W. C. B. has resorted to his interpretation. As we have shown that his interpretation of the phrase *aphesis amartioon* is erroneous, we will now proceed to show that the passages now under discussion do not countenance the idea of remission or forgiveness as connected with and dependent upon baptism.

The reader is referred to the considerations already presented which have shown, clearly and conclusively, from other passages of the scriptures, that forgiveness of sins is inseparably, invariably and immediately connected with the exercise of repentance and faith, so that there needs no intervention of man or ceremony to bring the repenting and believing soul into the enjoyment of pardon. A single consideration will suffice to show that Mark 1: 4 and Luke 3: 3 are in perfect analogy and entire conformity with the same doctrine.—“John did baptize in the wilderness and did preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.” “He came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.”—*Baptisma metanoias eis aphasis amartioon*. In both these instances the phrase, *eis aphasis amartioon*, should be construed with *metanoia* and not with *baptisma*. John characterized his baptism as one of repentance: “I indeed baptize you in water unto repentance” —*eis metanoian*. The phrase here added, *eis aphasis amartioon*, does not characterize the baptism, but, construed with *metanoia*, points out the

connection between repentance and remission of sins. The construction which we maintain is the natural one, (the preposition being immediately and alone interposed between the nouns, *metanoia* and *aphesis*.) and is not to be departed from unless some controlling reason be shown to overrule the argument drawn from the position and natural order of the words. For similar reasons, in Rom. 6: 4, *thanaton* is construed with *baptisma* and not with *sunetaphamen*, we are not buried into death, but by baptism into death.

If this conclusion be correct, we can readily ascertain the meaning that should be assigned to *eis*, and consequently the interpretation of the whole phrase, by comparing it with analogous passages. What then is proper the interpretation of *metanoia eis aphasis amartion*?

In Acts 11: 18. we read: "Then hath God also unto the Gentiles granted repentance unto life"—*metanoian eis zoen*. This was the exclamation of all the Jewish christians in Jerusalem (including the apostles) on hearing Peter's narrative of his mission to Cornelius, and God's wonderful doings. He had granted to Cornelius and his kinsmen and near friends, repentance, which resulted in eternal life—*Eis* then, in this passage, must mean the result; life the consequence of repentance. So Hackett *eis zoen* ecclastic, *unto life*, i. e., such repentance as secures it. So Gill, "a repentance from dead works, and is attended with a life of faith and issues in eternal life."

Again, 2 Cor. 7: 10; "For godly sorrow worketh repentance unto salvation"—*metano-*

ianeis soolarian. *Eis* here must signify the result; repentance whose consequence is salvation. A contrast is stated between godly sorrow and the sorrow of the world which "worketh death."

So 2 Tim. 2: 25: "If God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth"—*metanoian eis epignosin*. The acknowledging of the truth is represented as the consequence of the repentance. So Gill: "Repentance here designs a repentance of errors in principle, a change of mind upon conviction, and such as issues in a free and ingenuous confession and acknowledgement of the truth before exposed."

See how perfectly analagous, *in* phrase and in doctrine, these passages are with those under consideration. The preposition *eis* in each case connecting together two nouns, of which the first is the cause, and the second the result, or consequence, or effect. Repentance the cause, the effect or consequence is life, salvation the acknowledging of the truth, the forgiveness of sins. It is impossible to find scriptures more uniform in expression and more harmonious, not to say, identical in doctrine.

If, therefore, we are correct in construing *eis aphasin* with *metanoia* in Mark 1: 4 and Luke 3: 3, these passages furnish no countenance, but the most explicit denial to the dogma, that remission of sins (no matter what it means) is the result of baptism. We shall show before we conclude, that, if our mode of construing *eis aphasin* with *metanoia* should

not be adopted, the dogma referred to is not here taught.

The only other passage in which baptism is spoken of in connection with remission of sins, is that noted one in Peter's Pentecost sermon: Acts 2: 38. Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins. In this passage, we must construe *eis aphesin amartionon* with *baptisthutoo* and not with it and *metanoiasate* jointly, as some do. The natural order and position of the words in the sentence require it. The change of construction requires it, for *metanoiasate* is the second person plural, and *baptisthatoo* is the third person singular, having *ekastos* for its subject. Repent ye and let each one of you be baptized for the remission of sins. Construing thus, in order to ascertain the correct interpretation of the sentence, it will be worth while to consider with some minuteness the use of *baptizo* in connection with the preposition *eis*, and other prepositions, and the design of the ordinance.

Baptizo, as we have seen, means *immerse*, and the material into which the immersion is made, is preceded by *eis* or *en*, or it is put in the dative without a preposition.

Examples of the first, Mark 1: 9: Was baptized by John into the Jordan—*eiston Jordanan*.

Of the second, Mark 3: 6: Were baptized in the Jordan—*en too Iordana*. 3: 11: I baptize you in water—*en udati*, i. e., he shall baptize you in the Holy Ghost—*en pneumat*. So Mark 1: 5, 8, Luke 3: 16, John 1: 26, 31: 33, Acts 1: 5, 11: 16.

Of the third, Mark 3: 11: He shall baptize you in the Holy Ghost and in *fire, puri*. Luke 3: 16: I indeed baptize you *in water, udati*, * * * he shall baptize you in the Holy Ghost and in fire, *puri*. Acts 1: 5: John truly baptized in water, *udati*.

The effect of baptism (as we have stated, Baptism of Jesus p.24) is simply to initiate its receiver into the kingdom of heaven, visibly set up on earth, by the preaching of John the Baptist. The moral qualifications for admittance into this kingdom were repentance towards God and faith in the Messiah, now come upon earth. Repent ye for the kingdom of heaven is at hand: Mat. 3: 2. From that time Jesus began to preach and to say, Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand: Mat. 13: 17. Repent and believe in the gospel: Mark 1: 15. Repent and be baptized every one of you: Mark 2: 38. Then they that gladly received the word were baptized: Acts 2: 41. If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus is the Son of God: Acts 8: 37. Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved: Acts 16: 31. When they believed Philip's preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women. When Simon believed also, and when he was baptized, &c.: Acts 8: 12, 13. These quotations suffice to show a profession of repentance and faith were made by the recipients of baptism. In entering the kingdom of heaven, Jesus Christ

was acknowledged as King, and the initiated member vowed allegiance to his monarch.—Baptism was appointed by the statutes of the kingdom, to be the mode of professing faith in the Son of God, and unreserved consecration to his service. The symbolical meaning of baptism accords most beautifully with this profession. The washing of the body symbolizes the purification of the soul, wrought by the spirit, through the faith of Jesus Christ. The necessity of this washing teaches the sinfulness of the heart, which requires repentance to bring it to Jesus Christ. The burial in the water symbolizes at once the death of Jesus Christ as the atonement for sin and the death of the believer to sin.—The rising from the watery grave typifies both the resurrection of the Savior by the glory of the Father, and the rising of the believer that he should walk in newness of life. In accordance then with the symbol of baptism, the christian professes faith in the gospel and vows obedience to its precepts. The initiatory ordinance of the kingdom of heaven was the mode appointed by him who said, “Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father in heaven:” Mat. 10: 32.

The commission (Mat. 28: 19) which contains the baptismal formula, was the preposition *eis*, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. It is worthy of notice, that in the very first promulgation of the gospel, and duty of baptism, the apostle changes the preposition

and mentions the name, not of the Trinity, but only of the Savior Jesus Christ. Hackett, following De Webbe, suggests, that *epi* is used "as a matter of euphony, since *eis* follows in the next clause." This is probably correct, and, unquestionably, *eis to onoma* in the commission, and *epi too onomati* on the day of Pentecost are equivalent expressions. Still another preposition is used in Peter's order for the baptism of Cornelius and his friends. Acts 10: 48: "He commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord"—*en too onomati*. In other instances the *eis to onoma* of the commission is retained: Acts 8: 16, 19: 5.

Now in all these expressions, whether *eis*, *epi*, or *en* be used, the meaning is the same. And one thing is very clear: *eis* can not have, in them, the signification which implies *the procuring or obtaining the thing expressed by the following noun*. *Epi* and *en* never have this meaning, and *eis* cannot have it in the equivalent expressions which we have quoted. Moreover, such an interpretation is absurd and contradictory to the facts. By baptism men did not procure or obtain the name of the Lord, &c.

To be baptized in *the name*, &c., does not import that the baptism was administered by the authority of the Father, &c.; for, though *epi* or *en* might have that signification, *eis* never does. Nor does the expression mean a participation of the name, for though *eis* might in some cases have that meaning, *epi* and *en* never do; besides baptism did not, in fact, produce the result.

To obtain the correct and appropriate import of the expression, we must find an interpretation which will correspond to the three prepositions, *eis*, *epi*, and *en*. Such an interpretation is suggested by the fact before stated, that the act of baptism was, on the part of the baptized, a profession of repentance towards God, and of faith in the Son of God. This profession involved a grateful recognition of the Trinity; for it includes repentance towards the Father, recognition by the Holy Spirit, and Faith in Jesus Christ the Son of God. The *usus loquendi* of the three prepositions in question sustains this interpretation. Mat. 18: 20: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name"—*eis emon onoma*—that is, professing my religion and worshiping me. "In my name," says A. Clarke, "seems to refer particularly to a *public* profession of Christ and his gospel." Bretschneider also: *Ad profitendum meum nomen*, to profess my name, i. e., my religion.

Jere. 11: 21: "Prophesy not in the name of the Lord"—*epi onomati*. Id. 23: 25: "I have heard what the prophets said, that prophesy lies in my name, saying, I have dreamed, I have dreamed." Also 26: 9. In these instances, the meaning unquestionably is, that the prophets *professed* to speak for the Lord, though they did not in some instances speak by his authority.

Acts 9: 27, 28: "How he had preached boldly at Damascus in the name of Jesus. * * * And he spake boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus"—*en onomati*. Kuinoel comments thus:

libere Jesum ejusque doctrinam professus est, openly professed Jesus as his doctrine. 1 Peter 4: 14: "If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye"—*en onomati*. If professing Christ with fidelity brings reproach upon you. Bretschneider: *Quia Christum profitemini*, because ye profess Christ.

Christian baptism is a public profession, and was designed by the law of the gospel so to be. The candidate introduced by baptism into the visible kingdom of heaven, professes the moral qualifications which are requisite for his admission, and the allegiance which binds him to Jesus as Savior and King. The baptismal formula corresponds to this profession, and if there be anything elliptical in the phraseology, the ellipsis is clearly indicated by the fact, that baptism is the great ordinance of christian initiation. If, therefore, *eis* is to be considered *final*, as pointing out the result, the thing intended is not *procure* or *obtain*, (which would be absurd and false in fact,) but *profess*, which corresponding with the meaning of *baptize*, corresponds equally with the intention and the actual result. To be baptized into, in, or upon, (*eis, en, epi,*) the name of the Lord, in the baptismal formula, and in the narratives of actual baptisms, means to be baptized into, in, or upon the profession of the gospel.

There are other instances in which *eis* is used in connection with *baptizo* and *onoma* is omitted. These are Rom. 6: 3, *eis christon Iason, eis thanaton*, Gal. 3: 27, *eis christon*. In several instances, baptism is mentioned in reference not to the Deity, but to men, as 1 Cor. 1: 13,

eis onoma Paulou, in the name of Paul; id. 1: 15, *eis emon onoma*, in my own name; id. 10: 2, *eis ton Moonsan*, into Moses. One other passage remains and is peculiar, 1 Cor. 12: 13, baptized into one body, *eis en sooma*.

We will briefly consider the passages in which *baptizo* is followed by *eis*, to ascertain whether, and how far they conform to the views above taken:

Mark 1: 9, "Were baptized by John into the Jordan"—*eis* here is literal, and has its appropriate meaning, *into*, referring to motion and place. Acts 8: 16, "Only they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus"—*eis* in this passage is tropical, no actual motion or place being intended. The reference implied by the preposition is easily gathered from the context. "They that were scattered abroad went every where *preaching the word*. Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria and *preached Christ* unto them. And the people with one accord gave heed unto those things which Philip spake," (ver. 4-6.) "But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women," (ver. 12.) Now, this baptism was, as appears in the sixteenth verse, into the name of the Lord Jesus. For reasons, before stated, this does not imply that it was by his authority, or to partake of his name. It was not that they might receive the Holy Ghost, for this was conferred afterwards through the imposition of hands by the apostles Peter and John. The reference must be to the reception and acknowl-

edgment of the *word preached*, namely, *Christ*, which acknowledgment was made by baptism. To be baptized into the name of the Lord, in Samaria, was to profess Christ, and be introduced into his visible kingdom. That it did not procure remission of sins is evident from the case of Simon; for Peter declared to him after his baptism, "Thou hast neither part nor lot in the matter, for thy heart is not right in the sight of God. * * * * I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity," (ver. 21, 23.) The facts here answer to a *profession of Christ* and to *nothing more*. And if being baptized into the name of the Lord implied *only a profession* in the case of Simon, it implied no more in the case of others. All the difference that existed was in the heart, and the faithful embracing of the doctrines professed. The meaning here, then, is identical with that of the baptismal formula.

1 Cor. 1: 13, 15. "Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in [*eis*, into] the name of Paul? I thank God I baptized none of you but Crispus and Gaius; lest any should say that I had baptized in [*eis* into] my own name." Paul is here condemning the Corinthians for their divisions, and his reference to their baptism is evidently to remind them, that thus they had professed to take Christ, and Christ alone as their head and leader, in accordance with the words of Jesus himself, (Mat. 23: 8, 10.) "For one is your master, even Christ." But, if the Corinthians had by their baptism solemnly acknowledged

Christ as their King, and bound themselves to his service, what folly and sin did they not commit in forsaking him, and claiming to be "some of Paul, and some of Apollos, and some of Cephas," instead of all claiming to be Christ. The phrase, *baptized into the name*, here also means the *profession*, and not the *procuring* or *obtaining* the thing signified by the following noun.

We come now to passages which omit the word *onoma*, name.

1 Cor. 10: 2, "And were all baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Moses was the leader of the Israelites—the leader appointed by Heaven, and the type of the promised Messiah. Speaking of that Messiah, he said: (Deut. 18: 15,) "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet, from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me: unto him shall ye hearken." Moses had been raised up a Prophet by the Lord; so should the Lord raise up Jesus Christ. Moses was taken from the midst of the people; so should Jesus Christ be taken. Moses was raised up as a leader of his brethren; so should Jesus Christ be made the leader of his brethren. Moses was to deliver Israel from the bondage of Egypt; Jesus Christ from the bondage of sin, death, and hell. Moses was to conduct them to the promised land of rest; Jesus Christ to the Heavenly Canaan. The followers of Jesus were baptized into him when they publicly professed his leadership and acknowledged his dominion; so the followers of Moses were baptized into him. Up to the time of their

departure from Egypt, the Israelites, though properly God's people, were under Pharaoh's dominion. When they went forth they renounced him and acknowledged Moses, the leader sent from God, as their leader. And as the passage through the Red Sea was the event which *visibly* separated them from the former and transferred them to the latter, the Apostle says they were baptized into Moses. His leadership was now publicly acknowledged, and henceforth not only themselves, but all men looked upon them as followers of Moses, bound to obey his laws and reverence his authority, as the laws and authority of heaven. Then baptism was the irrevocable acknowledgment of Moses as their ruler. *Eis* here does not imply *procuring or obtaining* but *profession*.

Rom. 6: 3, 4, "Know ye not that as many of us as were baptized into (*eis*) Jesus Christ, were baptized into (*eis*) his death? Therefore we were buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." The Apostle having laid down, established, and confirmed the doctrine of justification by faith, is here answering an objection. He is showing that the state of grace in which the believer is placed, so far from furnishing any ground for continuing in sin, affords the strongest reason for a life of holiness, obedience, and trust. For this purpose, he refers to the baptism of the believer, and from its emblematical import draws his argument. Faith makes the believer one with Christ: he thus becomes a member of Christ's

body : Eph. 5: 30, "For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones."—1 Cor. 12: 12, "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many are one body : so also is Christ." Of the effects of this union, if not of the union itself, baptism is an emblematic representation. As baptism typifies the death and burial of Jesus Christ ; so also it is an emblem of the believer's death to sin and burial to the world. As it typifies the resurrection of Jesus from the dead ; so it is an emblem of the believer's walking in newness of life. The believer's death to sin, and his new life of spiritual holiness, which are equally the result of his incorporation with Christ, are emblematically expressed by his baptism *into Christ, and into Christ's death*, which death is the foundation of his acceptance with God. The rite of baptism is administered on the supposition and profession of the incorporation of the believer with Christ, *not to procure* incorporation, on the ground that he has actually participated in the death of Christ, *not to procure* participation. The entire exhortation of the Apostle proceeds from this foundation, and his argument is drawn from the actual death of Christ, in whom the believer also died : "knowing this that one old man is crucified with him," and "if we have been planted together, [rather *grown together into one, sumphutoi*—Robinson's Lex] in the likeness of his death, &c." This, then, is the reasoning of Paul : In respect to the believer, the old man was crucified with Christ ; you have avowed this in regard to your-

SOUTHWESTERN BAPTIST

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY

2825 LEXINGTON ROAD

LOUISVILLE, KY.

self by "being buried with Christ in baptism : (Col. 2: 12,) you have professed that ye are now "walking in newness of life" inasmuch as "ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God." If, therefore, what ye have professed in baptism be a reality "through faith" then (Rom. 6. 11) "reckon yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord."—"If through faith, the baptized had died, the emblematic import of his baptism is a verity ; otherwise, the foundation failing, the whole superstructure sinks. The phrases, baptized into Christ, and into his death, we perceive, do not signify a *procurement* of either, but a condition already obtained by faith, and professed in baptism.

Gal. 3: 27, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." The Apostle, after arguing to prove the necessity and show the effects of faith, had declared that after "faith is come, we are no longer under a school-master, for (says he) *ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.*" Having, therefore, been brought to Christ, (ver. 24) "that we might be justified by faith," and having thus become "the children of God," Paul could not mean that we are baptized in order to obtain, to procure Christ, but that thus sincerely professing Christ, the believer puts on, assumes the character, temper, and spirit of Christ, the Son of God. The phrase, *put on*, refers to the ancient custom still preserved in Baptist churches, of changing the garments and putting on other clothes after baptism. Te

appeal is made to the consciousness of the Galatians. In professing Christ, ye professed that ye possessed his spirit. If, indeed, it is so, external distinctions of Jew or Greek, slave or free, male or female are of no consequence, "for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise."

So far we have found no passage which countenanced the notion, that *eis* following *baptizoo* means *to procure or obtain*. We will now consider 1 Cor. 12: 13, "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that body, being many, are onebody, so also is Christ, For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, *eis en sooma*, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free; and have all been made to drink into one spirit. For the body is not one member but many." Here, manifestly, there is no reference to water but to the Holy Spirit, and the result of the operation of that spirit, through faith, making the believer one with Christ, is intended. *Eis* is construed as in Gen. 2: 24, Mat 19: 6, Mark 10: 8, 1 Cor. 6: 16, Eph. 5: 31, "They two shall be one flesh," *eis mian sarka*. "Baptized into one body," that is "so as to become one body." But this is the effect of the spirit, and the meaning is not to *procure or obtain*, but to *become* the thing signified by the noun following the preposition. In like manner by baptism in water, the believer *becomes* a member of the visible kingdom of God.

We will now consider the phrase, in Mat. 3: 11, "I indeed baptize you in water into re-

penitance," *eis metanoian*. That the people were not baptized by John, in order to procure repentance is evident from the facts of the case. John preached repentance, baptism followed. They who were baptized, confessed their sins: they "were baptized in the Jordan confessing their sins." Their baptism had reference to their past experience and present determination; the acknowledgement and renunciation of sin, and the vow so to reform as thenceforth to "bring forth fruit worthy of repentance." Baptism into repentance implies this profession.

Acts 19; 3, requires but a single remark.— "Unto what then were ye baptized? And the said, unto John's baptism." There is here manifestly no *procuring* or *obtaining*. Conformably to what doctrine or profession were you baptized? Conformably to those which John preached.

Having now considered every passage in the New Testament in which *baptizoo* is followed by *eis*, and having previously settled, from the *usus loquendi*, the meaning of *aphesis amartion*, we are prepared to determine the import of the passage, Acts 2: 38, "Let each of you be baptized unto the forgiveness of sins." The ascertained *usus loquendi* must govern.

We have seen that *eis*, when used in connexion with *baptizoo*, *no where* has the signification of *procuring* or *obtaining* the thing signified by the following noun. In I Cor. 12: 13, where a future result is looked to, the meaning is to *become*, not to *procure* or *obtain*. In all other cases this reference is to an antecedent

fact, producing a present profession and purpose. To give therefore, to *eis* here, the signification of *procuring* or *obtaining* is to violate the fundamental principle of interpretation, because it would be a departure from the *usus loquendi* of every analogous passage in the Scriptures. On the contrary by adhering to the *usus loquendi* as drawn from the passages cited, and recollecting the connexion between faith and repentance on the other, as already pointed out, the interpretation is simple, easy, intelligible, and in perfect harmony with the whole tenor of the Gospel preached by Christ and his Apostles. "Repent" says Peter. Three thousand did repent. Was their repentance barren or fruitless, until a rite or ceremony could be performed? Or did they not, when they "gladly received the word" experience the joy of believing and the peace of pardoned souls? Let the experience of the hundreds of thousands of baptized believers testify. Baptism is the "answer of a good conscience" because it is at once the act and the pledge of obedience, of him who through faith has obtained the peace of God. The baptism therefore, which Peter commanded, and the three thousand received on the day of Pentecost, had reference to repentance experienced and forgiveness enjoyed through that repentance; to the antecedent fact and not to following results. The design of baptism was known and considered. It was an act of confession and profession. Sinfulness and rebellion were confessed, and renounced; peace and pardon through the death

of Jesus were professed; and everlasting allegiance and devotion pledged to that Lord whom a few weeks before, they had with wicked hands crucified and slain.

The reason why Peter, in this instance (the only one in the New Testament) couples the baptism of the repenting Jews with the forgiveness of sins may be readily conjectured.—

One of the emblematical significations of baptism is the purification of soul by the removal of sin, symbolized by the "bodies washed with pure water." The Apostle had just charged upon his congregation the heinous offence of scorning, rejecting and killing THE LORD AND THE CHRIST, who nevertheless was now exalted and sitting on the right hand of the Father until his foes should be made his footstool. Yet that merciful High Priest, in the agonies of the cross had prayed "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," and enormous as was their guilt, the simple act of repentance would bring them into favor with God and remove their transgression from them. While therefore, in baptism they would confess Jesus before the world, and bind themselves to his service, it was especially appropriate to mention it as a sign of their confidence that their sins had been forgiven.

We have before stated that in Mark 1: 4, and Luke 3: 3, *aphesis amartion*, remission of sins, should be construed with *metanoia*, being the result of repentance. If, however, any shall still contend that *aphesis* in these passages should be construed with *baptisma*, the

reasons stated in regard to Acts 2: 28, will apply here. The sense of *procure* or *obtain* not being sustained by the *usus loquendi* of any other passage in the New Testament cannot properly apply here. All the circumstances narrated in reference to John's baptism establish the fact that he baptized only those who professed to repent. This fact, the design of baptism, and the *usus loquendi* compel us to the interpretation (if *aphesis* be construed with *baptisma*) which understands the latter to be professedly received as a token of the former.

In conclusion we may recapitulate the result to which our investigation has led us. The phrase *aphesis amartion* means the actual pardon or forgiveness of the sinner and the removal of his sin, transgression and guilt. Resulting from the goodness of God through the atonement of Jesus Christ, it is contingent upon the faith and repentance of the sinner, and immediately upon the act of faith which brings the sinner into union with Christ, he enjoys the pardon and the peace which Jesus bestows. The act of baptism declares all that the believer has experienced and does. It is not an act which procures for the sinner or bestows upon him actual forgiveness. It is not a declaration by Jesus Christ that the man's sins are or have been pardoned, for the facts too often contradict and refute all idea of pardon. It is not a declaration by the administrator that a pardon formerly granted is now legally established so as to set the prisoner free, for Jesus Christ has conferred no such

authority on a human agent. As the Lord is immediately approached, and has direct communication with the sinner first in granting peace and afterwards in bestowing all grace, so he acts without intervention of man or ceremony in making known to the recipient the blessings which he is to enjoy. But baptism is a declaration by the receiver of it, that he is a sinner, polluted, corrupt, and lost; that he has seen and appreciates the character of Jesus Christ as Redeemer, Savior and King; that he renounces his sin and rebellion and submits to the King of Sion, that he has reason to believe that his sins have been pardoned thro' faith in the crucified, and that now he confesses before men that crucified Jesus, pledging to him as his King, unreserved obedience, entire consecration and thorough submission.— And by this declaration, denouncing the world, and professing allegiance to Jesus Christ, he becomes by baptism a member of his kingdom visibly set up on earth, as by faith he had become a member of his spiritual kingdom.—

The position which baptism occupies in the Gospel scheme has been a matter of dispute ever since men began to confound the sign with the thing signified, the profession with the reality. Especially have mistakes on this point been rife, and pregnant with unnumbered evils, since men, departing from the simple teachings of revelation, have invented a theory which without precept or example* in the

* "Commands, or plain and certain, examples [of infant baptism] in the New Testament relative to it, I do not find. Nor with my views of it, do I need them."—M. Stuart: *Baptism*, p. 190. Ed. 1855.

word of God to sustain it, changes baptism from a profession of grace experienced and allegiance pledged, and makes it either an *opus operatum* by which actual regeneration is produced; or a seal of a promise (which God never made) which exists only in the superstitious notions of the conscious actors in the solemn farce.

What then is the Gospel position of baptism? It is sufficiently made known by the words of Jesus, "*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.*" Baptism has reference to faith. Faith in the baptized is past, present, and future. Baptism refers to it in all.—It professes an act of faith which at some previous time, an hour, a month, or a year ago (it is immaterial; but the sooner a believer obeys Christ the better) united the believer to Christ and procured pardon for his sins; it professes allegiance to Jesus Christ now and forever; and renders *obedience* to the great initiatory ordinance of the kingdom of Heaven as a *pledge* of a life of obedience. Thus he confesses Christ before men that Christ may confess him when he comes in glory. So with the heart man believeth unto righteousness and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.

The first great abiding duty of all men is to repent and believe the Gospel. From the moment when a man believes his whole duty may be comprised in one word—OBEDIENCE. Ecc. 12: 13. "Fear God and keep his commandments, for that is the whole duty of man." John 14: 15. "If ye love me, keep my com-

mandments." "If a man love me, he will keep my words, * * * * * He that loveth me not, keepeth not my sayings." After the act of faith which binds the believer to and incorporates him with Christ, the first great public act of obedience is BAPTISM which confesses Christ. Jesus has put it first for this purpose, and that it may initiate his new born subject into his visible kingdom, and that it may be a pledge of a lifetime service and the badge of unfailing discipleship.

Hence we see the folly and the sin of those who attempt to shift the responsibility of obvious and paramount duty by raising the question whether baptism be essential to salvation. BAPTISM is essential to OBEDIANCE, and OBEDIANCE is the test of LOVE TO JESUS CHRIST. The man who tries to debate how little duty he may do, and how much he may omit without failing of salvation, has reason to believe that he is still "in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity." It is not for man to say how far one may fail of obedience and yet not fail of Heaven; but he is an unsafe counsellor who advises that any duty may be omitted. CHRIST THE KING has given us laws of universal force; and has invested no POPE, COUNCIL, CONFERENCE, ASSEMBLY, SYNOD, PRESBYTERY, nor any EARTHLY, no, nor any HEAVENLY tribunal with a *dispensing power* to abrogate, or set aside, or modify his laws.

Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, *immersing* them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, *teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you:* and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.—Amen.