

266

# A VINDICATION

CONCERNING AND CONTAINING

H. T. ANDERSON'S LETTERS.

—BY—

J. B. MOODY OF THE BAPTIST GLEANER.

*Baptism*



In preaching and debating on Acts 2:38, when I come to that part of the argument which considers the *general tenor* of New Testament rendering of the preposition *eis*, it has been my custom to examine this part of the subject in the light of ten translations, in about the following way. This preposition occurs in the New Testament about 1700 times, and in King James version, is translated about 47 different ways. That Mr. H. T. Anderson who translated the New Testament twice for the "Current Reformation," translated Acts 2:38, "Repent and be immersed every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of sins." And to show his consistency, and fondness for this translation of *eis* he renders Matt. 3:11, "I immerse you in water in order to repentance." So Campbell, McGarvey and others of that school had rendered Acts 2:38; and all their debaters and teachers had endorsed that translation as the meaning of *eis*; and the emphasis they lay on it,

and the use they make of it, show that they not only regard that as the general, but as the universal and invariable meaning. Whether you translate it by "for," "into," "into," "to," etc., the meaning is the same — *in order to*. To show their mistake in this, we try the plan of substitution, as they are fond of doing on the action of baptism. This we sometimes do through a chapter, or in the passages where it is connected with *baptize*. Thus I easily show that *eis* can't have this as its general meaning.

I next proceed to ascertain to what extent it has this meaning in the New Testament, and find that in the ten translations, "in order to," is found about thirty odd times, and that Mr. Anderson furnishes twenty odd of these; Mr. Campbell about five; Wilson's Diaglott about five, and that most of the ten, including King James and the late revision, do not translate thus at all, making the ratio about thirty odd to seventeen thousand, or about one to five hundred.

I then proceed to cut that proposition smaller by stating that as Mr. Campbell and Wilson were advocates of baptismal remission, that according to the custom on controverted topics, I would rule them out; and as Mr. Anderson, when he got older, and wiser, *changed his views about baptism*, and as his translation had passed out of his hands so he could not change that, that we would let him change, or take back his translation of Acts 2:38 *in our count*, and then the ratio would be reduced to about one to five thousand.

These facts and figures have never been denied, and I have used them in all my debates with this school, and they have also been used by the other brethren in their discussions.

In this connection I have generally stated that Mr. Anderson, in his ripe old age, changed his views on this, and other important subjects, and this he freely communicated to Dr. J. M. Frost, Sr., of Harrodsburg, Ky.; that encouraged by Dr. Frost he freely uttered his later convictions; that I had read the same with my own eyes; that I had spoken to Dr. Caperton to reproduce it in the *Western Recorder*, then I would furnish it to the readers of the GLEANER.

These facts were not denied until I met Mr. Lipscomb in debate. Mr. L., having heard of these statements, and discrediting them, he wrote Prof. J. W. McGarvey, and with his note he challenged my statement of the whole matter as related above.

In my search for the letter, I promised to produce, I found another, nearly as strong, and which proved my assertion that Mr. Anderson did not endorse my opponents proposition of "baptism for the remission of sins." In publishing this letter, I stated that there were other letters from Mr. Anderson verifying my statement, and which should appear in time. I also published an extract from another letter of Mr. Anderson to the same point, and also one from Dr. J. M. Frost, Jr., corroborating my statement as to the conversation Mr. A., had with his father.

Notwithstanding all this, including my positive assertion that I had seen the letter of Mr. A., on Acts 2:38 with my own eyes, etc., yet Mr. Lipscomb, as if bent on mischief, proceeded violently, and maliciously to impeach my veracity; and when I saw them building a gallows "fifty cubits high" to hang me on, I thought I would wait in dignified patience to see how high they would build it, for I well knew who was to hang thereon.

And now to show the spirit of my assailants, as well as to vindicate myself, I will give enough of what has passed through Mr. Lipscomb's paper to give the reader a satisfactory understanding of the matter, and my reason for this defense.

In the *Advocate* of March 3d, 1886, the same paper in which he professed to have copied from the GLEANER the Anderson letter on "The Disciples," the editorial page is filled with an ar-

ticle headed

MR. MOODY'S PROMISE.

This is supported by certificates from J. M. Kidwell and T. W. Brents, from which we will give such extracts as bear upon this issue.

Mr. Lipscomb says:

I did not believe that Anderson had written such a letter simply because I had seen nothing from him on that subject, and I believe it would have been so paraded by the Baptist papers that I would have seen it. I wrote to J. W. McGarvey, asking if he had heard of such; he wrote as follows:

Lexington, Ky., Nov. 16, 1886.

Dear Bro. Lipscomb.—Yours of the 13th is before me. I have a vague impression that Bro. Anderson wrote something favorable to the Baptist on some point, but I think it had reference to the influence of the Holy Spirit. His translation was his latest deliberate utterance on the meaning of Acts 2:38, and he renders the disputed clause "in order to remission of sins." I am sure that he did not retract or modify this rendering.

J. W. MCGARVEY.

Now note reader the issue between us: Was Mr. Anderson's translation his latest deliberate utterance on Acts 2:38? Did he modify or retract this meaning? Here is the issue as Mr. Lipscomb further on acknowledges:

In the debate, instead of presenting the letters, he stated that he had seen the letter, that it had been published in the Recorder.

(Yes, I so stated most emphatically.)

\* \* \* Moody had read it himself, and had Dr. Caperton, the editor, then hunting it up and would publish it. I expressed doubt of it ever being found.

(In other words intimated that I lied; said I was a back wood's teacher and not worthy of credence.)

I knew Anderson had, in his old age, written a letter favoring the Baptists, and teaching some things not believed by the disciples, but not on this subject.

Note reader—"on this subject."

What subject? Why, clearly as stated by Prof. McGarvey—baptism for remission of sins, which we were then debating. In other words, a later utterance on Acts 2:38 than his translation.

Since then I received the following letter from Moody:

Fulton, Ky., Jan. 12, 1886.

Dear sir.—I have written 'here and there' to get the H. T. Anderson letter referred to in our debate. I find there were more than one. I have the main one and hope to get the others. I wish to publish with them a letter of Prof. McGarvey that the issue between us may clearly come out. Will you be kind enough to furnish me a copy of said letter for that purpose? As soon as I am through with Dr. Jones I will attend to the matters brought from the debate. Please give me a letter. Can't you come down and see Dr. Jones thresh me? With very kindest regards, I am yours truly.

J. B. MOODY.

I sent a copy of McGarvey's letter. In GLEANER of Feb. 17th, he publishes a letter dated Jan. 16, 1871, written by H. T. Anderson, from Caroline Co., Va., to J. T. Melish of the Journal and Messenger, the Baptist paper published in Cincinnati, on the subject of Union of Baptists and disciples, a question then agitated in Ohio, in which, while there are some things objectionable to the disciples, and showing a decided leaning to some Baptist errors, there is not an allusion to *eis*, or its translation in any shape or form. Our recollection is that we published th's letter and criticised it on its first appearance, as did others of our papers, though we fail to find it in our file. We know we read it and knew well of its existence and still another letter on the subject of Spiritual influence.

"Another letter on the subject of Spiritual influence," but none on Acts 2:38. Very well, Mr. Haman, go on with your gallows, Mordecai sits at the gate.

Why did not Bro. Moody publish McGarvey's letter after requesting it for publication? Clearly he failed to do it because that LETTER BROUGHT OUT THE ISSUE, and

Moody found he could not meet that and had determined to substitute another one (A positive issue of veracity. M) I am sorry you have taken this course. No fair man who heard what occurred at Watertown can believe you have done what you promised to do.

It would have been so much more like a Christian to have said, I fail to find what I thought I had seen, and publish this letter as all that I can find showing Anderson in his old age had a leaning toward certain Baptist teachings, and we would have agreed to it all, and given Bro. Moody credit for candor and fairness.

But the publishing of this as a fulfillment of your promise and the saying I promised to publish this letter is untruthful from beginning to end.

The reader will decide whether the publication of that letter sustained, as far as it went, our position that Anderson in his old age did not endorse baptism for the remission of sins. And this is the issue as all well know.

Bro. Moody promised to publish that letter. He has not done it. He palms off another wholly different one, written from a different state, to a different person at a different time on a wholly different subject, in which that translation is not referred to, and I am sorry to say dishonors himself by claiming it as a fulfillment of his promise. We publish it, not because we ever promised to publish it, but to show how Bro. Moody fails to comply with his promise, and then sorrowfully to show how he lacks candor and manhood to acknowledge this failure.

The matter assumed an importance only as to whether the letter could be produced. \* \* \*

Now reader turn back to my letter to Mr. L. and see if in the first sentence I did not confess that the letter I then published was not the one promised. I said it was not the let-

ter, for there were more than one and then promised in time to produce the other. But Mr. L. seemed blood thirsty and could not longer withhold his hand. Go on Haman.

We never believed he was crazy enough to reject *in order to* as the translation of *eis*, Acts 2:38.

We append letters from Bros. Kidwill and Brents showing our statement of the issue is correct. D. L.

Mr. Kidwill's memory was so poor, and his report so incorrect, that we can afford space for only a short extract or two.

I was Bro. Lipscomb's moderator in the Watertown debate, and I think I understand the question at issue concerning the Anderson letter. The large crowd present the last day of the discussion will remember 'hat after the close of the discussion, I called attention to this matter and insisted on the importance of having a clear understanding of the question at issue concerning the Anderson letter. \* \* \*

In the Anderson letter as republished in the GLEANER, Bro. Anderson only incidentally mentions the fact that he had made two translations of the New Testament, but says not one word about his rendering of *eis* in Acts 2:38, nor does Anderson say one word about his rendering of a single word in the New Testament. As Bro. Lipscomb stated in the debate, there are things in this letter that we do not endorse but not one word about being wrong in his translation. The question between Bro. Lipscomb and Eld. Moody has nothing to do with H. T. Anderson's faith as a Christian, but with his work as a scholar. J. M. KIDWILL.

The part of this letter left out contains ten misstatements, and we give one above as a sample. "As Bro. Lipscomb stated in the debate, there are things in this letter that we do

not endorse, but not one word about being wrong in his translation." How could Mr. Lipscomb say all this "in the debate," which came off two months before the appearance of the letter? Mr. Kidwill was confused sure enough.

Now comes Mr. Brents with his say.

I was at the debate at Watertown, and took copious notes of Mr. Moody's speeches. The substance of Mr. Moody's statement on the matter of difference was that H. T. Anderson had written and published a letter taking back his translation of eis, "in order to," in Acts 2:38 as an error, while Bro Lipscomb denied that any letter had ever been published by Anderson purporting to be a correction of his translation in that particular.

T. W. BRENTS.

What we did say was, that Mr. Anderson had changed his view of the proposition—"Baptism for the remission of sins," and had so published to the world, and that since he could not correct his translation, we would let him take it back in our count. We will not charge collusion, but when three men misunderstand a thing just alike, we can't help thinking about it.

In the Advocate of March 17th we find these words from D. L.:

His publication of the letter proves we were right, and his endeavor to palm off something else for it casts a shadow over his veraciousness. Bro. Eastes cannot help knowing in his heart this is true.

In this issue he more than fills his editorial page on "H. T. Anderson's Letter." In this we are charged again with inability to prove our assertion and says—"Kindness to Anderson and regard for their own good name

should prompt them to a discreet silence."

In his issue of March 24th D. L. says:

I exposed his teaching, the teaching of his creed, his utter failure to comply with his promise in reference to the Anderson letter, and his effort to substitute something else for this. We knew no pretty name to call this last, and was compelled to use a plain one.

The following from a correspondent -- Rambler, Aug. 4th, must suffice for samples of this character—"We learn that some of Mr. Moody's friends were still hoping for the promised Anderson letter, while some others had given it up. \* \* If he is not able to produce the much desired document; \* \* an honest confession is good for the soul."

What will our readers think when they see that all this and much more, both in private and public was done in the face of what I published in the same issue that I published the Anderson letter on "The Disciples;" in the face of the private letter I wrote Mr. Lipscomb, and which is herein published, and in which I promised that the letter referred to in the debate should be forth coming; in the face of what I stated and avowed in the debate, as my own personal testimony—what I had seen with my own eyes; and in the face of the following letter which also accompanied the other publication.

Selma, Ala., Dec. 30, 1885.

DEAR BRO MOODY:

I received your letter but am unable to furnish the letter. I have looked through some old papers of

my father's, but do not find the Anderson letter. That such a letter was written and published I am certain, though having no recollection definitely of its contents only that it was unfavorable to the view which his people took of Acts 2:38—such a' so was the purport of his conversation with my father.

I am surprised that Bro. McGarvey, whom I know quite well and esteem highly, does not remember the Anderson publication in the Recorder. If he remembered it, he would not deny it, you may be sure.

Bro. T. C. Bell, of Harrodsburg, or Bro. W. P. Harvey, same place, might remember more than I do of Anderson's conversation with my father. Prof. Farnam, of Georgetown, or Dr. Dobbs, of Columbus, Miss., would be likely able to tell you about the publication of the letter. Hope you may find it and republish.

Your brother,  
J. M. FROST.

In the face of all this, Mr. Lipscomb says in Gospel Advocate, of March 17th 1886,—“The Baptists are now claiming that he went, in his last days of feebleness, and confessed his wrong to a Baptist, committed the confession to him; and now, fifteen years after his death, they are telling of it with no ability to prove it.”

Thus he passes the sweeping sentence of falsehood on us all. How did he know we could not prove it? Had he given us time to do it?

This is only a small part of their desperate effort to break my character by impeaching my veracity, and this is only one of many efforts in this direction.

Now, I propose, not only a vindication of every jot and tittle of my assertion on this subject, but also to

put in permanent form for easy distribution, these grand utterances of this their best scholar, who perhaps for forty years pleaded the cause of the Reformation with superior power; but who at last, through the power of divine grace, and the illumination of the Holy Spirit, was brought to know the truth, and blessed with courage and clearness in its utterance.

To prove Mr. Anderson's change on these subjects it is necessary to quote only a few of his earlier utterances.

We clip the following from the Western Recorder, of March 11th 1871:

Eighteen years ago Mr. Anderson, in a labored defense of what was then, and what is now regarded as the great central dogma of Campbellism, wrote as follows: “Salvation from sins, redemption, remission of sins, are the property of immersed believers. On the outside of this camp there is no redemption promised in God's word. Hence baptism for, or in order to the remission of sins, is the command of Peter, by the authority of Jesus, sanctioned by God the Father and the Holy Spirit.” This quotation is from the “Christian Repository,” Vol. 1, pp. 350, from an article over the signature of H. T. Anderson, Louisville, Ky., and under the caption, “Baptism is for the remission of sins.” That article was one of a series of communications to the “Repository” in reply to an article previously published in the same magazine, headed, “Baptism is not for the remission of sins.” Has he abandoned this position?

In the Christian Repository of Nov. 1852, p. 648, Mr. Anderson says, *eis aphesis hamation* in Matthew 26:28, means in order to the remission of

sins, then this must be its meaning in Acts. Therefore the three thousand were baptized that they might have their sins remitted."

Same page, "Remission of sins is promised to the baptized."

Page 649, "Who are the saved? Without question, the baptized; for it is written, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. \* \* Salvation is found to be a promise or rather a thing promised after baptism."

This is enough to show that in those days he had the clear Campbellite ring. This was as far back as 1852. In 1864 he translated the New Testament, in which he clearly shows the same bias.

In 1869 his views seem to have changed, judging from his letter on "The safety of the people is the supreme law." We make the following extract.

Is there any life in the putting of a man under water, and raising him up again? None. Men are immersed because they are alive, not to receive life. There is a baptism in water and one in the Holy Spirit. Which is of the most value is easily known. The immersion in water can never introduce us all into one body. Men who are believers are free men. They are set free from sin.

To which the editor of the Apostolic Times of July 14, 1869 responds thus:

If these sentiments are to prevail, farewell to all that Alexander Campbell and Walter Scott exhorted or ever achieved. It has seen its day, spent its force, and done its work and henceforth sleeps the sleep of death.

Does this not indicate a change on

the subject of baptism?

His noted letter on "The Disciples" which we first published because it was the one we first found, we now publish in this form by request of many brethren. It is a clear statement of the issue, and may God bless it to the conversion of thousands from the same error.

#### DISCIPLES.

[The emphasis in large caps is mine; also the . Please note.—M.]

Bro. Melish: Dear Sir.—\*\*\* I addressed a short letter to Bro. Errett a few weeks ago, in which I stated that there was, so far as known to me, no difference between us and the Baptists, save on the subject of baptism. Since writing to him I have seen extracts from several communications written by Baptists, and I suppose that I am in error in thinking that we differ only on the subject of baptism. Still, it may be that our differences may all meet at that point; for an error at this point is, I conceive, radical. Now permit me to say, that I can not hope for a union of the two parties, Baptists and Disciples, unless there is an agreement at this point. How a union can be effected, when the two so widely differ on this subject, I can not see. It is summed up in a very few words: Disciples baptize men to make them Christians; Baptists baptize men because they are Christians. If Baptists are right in this, then the Disciples are wrong. Two parties entertaining sentiments so different can not unite.

Again: The subject of remission of sins, which is of the greatest importance, meets you both at the point of baptism. The Baptists argue for the remission of sins before, the Disciples after baptism, or immediately consequent upon it. How the two will harmonize here I am not able to see. Then, without baptism there is no new birth, according to the Disciples. Baptists can not accept of

this, I think Will Baptists ever admit that baptism in water is part of the new birth? The views of the new birth involve a subject vitally important—the influence of the Holy Spirit. Baptists understand that a man is born of the Spirit before he is baptized. Disciples will tell you that he is only begotten, and that his being buried in water and raised again completes this process, and makes a birth; hence the expression, “Born of water and of the Spirit.” The personal agency of the Holy Spirit is involved here. So it may be that all differences may meet at baptism; for the subject of remission of sins, which is connected with baptism, is also connected with the death of Jesus, his blood, and faith in his blood. And here would be the question of his sufferings for sins. Justification by faith must necessarily meet you both in baptism, and how you would agree is not for me to say. Baptism is a central point. It is an institution of Jesus Christ; and none but one truly divine can make an institution which stands connected with Father, Son and Holy Spirit. It is not my purpose to throw aught in the way of a better understanding. In a friendly spirit I would state the difficulties. Would a Baptist ever say that he was satisfied on the subject of his being a child of God, from the fact of his having been baptized? I think not. Would he not want the witness of the Spirit within him? Would a Baptist ever be content to say that his sins had been forgiven, because he had been baptized? I confess, my dear sir, with these difficulties before me, I am unable to see how a union can be effected. I have, I hope, candidly and fairly stated the differences. Then, in order to a union, one or the other must change views on the design of baptism. If a Baptist ever accepts such a proposition as this, “Baptism is for remission of sins,” then verily he must cease to be a Baptist. It would be considered a work not worthy of being done, if difficulties should be presented, and no way proposed by which those

difficulties might be obviated. It is vain to propose that we shall speak in the words of the Scriptures. However admirable this may seem, we hold not to it ourselves, nor do any of those who regard the Scriptures as all sufficient for faith and practice. Scriptures must be interpreted. Take, for example, this: “This is my body;” or, as the Latin has it, *Hoc est corpus meum*. Let the words stand as they are, and we convert bread into the real body of the Messiah. But we are warranted by Scripture in saying that IS, in this place, is equal to represents. Hence, we have the bread as a symbol, or, if any one prefer, an emblem of the body. Do we not constantly speak of the bread and the wine as emblems? This is legitimate interpretation. If we can, from the Scriptures, find the means of INTERPRETING THE WORDS OF PETER ON PENTECOST, then we may hope for a union of the Disciples and Baptists. But as long as such propositions as “Baptism is for the remission of sins” are discussed, so long will the Disciples and Baptists be separate peoples, provided that the proposition be explained thus: Immersion in water is for the remission of sins.

Let us turn again to the words, “This is my body.” Bread is commonly called the staff of life. Bread is that food on which life mainly depends; hence, it most aptly became the symbol of that body which was broken for us. Water washes away defilement, makes the body clean; hence it stands, most fitly, as a symbol of that blood wherein the soul is cleansed from sin. Now if we can find a passage that most clearly points out the special action of the blood of Christ, and the water of baptism, then have we succeeded in ESTABLISHING OUR INTERPRETATION. Let us have heart and body distinguished, and then we shall see how each is affected. In the Epistle to the Hebrews we read thus literally: “Sprinkling as to our hearts from an evil conscience, and washed as to our body with pure

water." The heart then is cleansed by the blood of Christ; the body is washed with water. HENCE THE PROPOSITION: BAPTISM IN WATER IS FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS, CAN NEVER BE SUSTAINED; for water affects only the body. But the blood affects the heart, as seen in the words above quoted, and can affect the heart ONLY THROUGH FAITH. In Rom. 6:4, 5, we have language that teaches us the meaning of baptism. It is the *likeness* of Christ's death and resurrection. If it is a likeness it is not the thing itself. Is it not, then, a SYMBOL? or, if any one prefer, an EMBLEM? These two places are sufficient for OUR purpose. Christ died, was buried and rose again; we are buried in water and raised again, as a LIKENESS of what he did. But the LIKENESS of his death can not affect our souls. We must apprehend him, lay hold on him BY FAITH, and be baptized in water as a SYMBOL of our being baptized into him in spirit. It is a significant fact that the Savior and the apostles never used the words, Baptized in water. We read, Be baptized into, or, for remission; Baptized into Christ; Baptizing them into the name of the Father; Baptized into death. (☞ How strange it would sound, were we to read, Baptized in water into Christ! Could any one accept such words? Suppose we read, Be baptized in water, in, or on the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, how could we accept it? Yet those to whom these words were spoken were baptized in water. How, then, shall we interpret this? Man is a compound of spirit and body. Baptism applies to the spirit as well as to the body. The spirit is baptized into Christ, into his death, and the body is baptized in water, as a SYMBOL of the baptism of the spirit into Christ. (☞)

Again: As the body is buried in water, so is the old man buried, and as the body is raised up, so the new man raises up. Of this burial of the old man, and raising up of the new, the burial in water and raising up of

the body is SYMBOLIC.

I will now make a statement of the general truth, which I hope will meet the approbation of all. It is not new, but very old. For every state of the inward man there is an outward FORM, an ACTION corresponding as a SIGN of that state. We bow the knee as a sign that the spirit is bowed; we prostrate the whole body as a sign of the prostrate state of our soul; we wear black as a sign of the mourning of the soul; we are raised out of the water as a SIGN that the new man raises to walk in a new life; we eat bread and drink wine as a sign that the soul feeds on the Savior by faith. There were the outward and the inward circumcision; the one in the flesh, and the other in the heart, in spirit. SO I UNDERSTAND BAPTISM. The baptism in water is the OUTWARD SIGN of that which takes place within; *signum visibilis gratiae invisibilis*—a visible sign of an invisible grace.

(☞) SO, I PERCEIVE, WILL ALL MEN UNDERSTAND WHO KNOW HOW TO INTERPRET THE LANGUAGE OF THE SCRIPTURES. When I read such expressions as "baptized into Christ," "baptized into his death," I look to the STATE of the man, not to the fact of his having been baptized in water, though I by no means disregard that fact. One of the best remarks that I ever heard from Bro. Campbell was this: "Paul had his spirit baptized into the Spirit of the Pentateuch." I understand that every Christian is baptized in spirit into the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and remain so baptized. We say of men they are immersed in sorrow, in debt, in sufferings. In the SAME SENSE of the word immerse, we say of those who love Christ that they are immersed in him. It is wholly unscriptural to limit the idea of baptism to the act of being buried in water. For one, I have never done so.

The Disciples are fond of the expression, "law of pardon." The Baptists can never accept of this. They would say that the idea of justifica-

tion by faith admits not of the idea of a law of pardon. (☞ Remission of sins is received by faith, not by obedience to a law ☞) Here you and the Disciples can never agree. I state the fact candidly. What is the remedy? The Disciples must, if they form union with you, accept of this: that faith is the only appropriating principle. By FAITH we RECEIVE the remission of sins; by faith we are justified; by faith we do all that we do, and everything done by a Christian is acceptable to God ONLY through faith. No work, as a work, can be acceptable to God. A work is acceptable to God only as it is an exponent of faith. Faith appropriates the promises of God. We do not get the promise by doing something for it. God gives, we receive. Grace, not law, reigns in the kingdom of God. You will not agree on the evidence of pardon, for the Disciples love the "law of pardon;" and when they have obeyed the law of pardon, they have the promise of pardon as the evidence of it.

Not so with the Baptists. He wants the Spirit bearing witness with his spirit that he is a child of God. Man is guilty before God, and he must FEEL this; he must know that he is condemned and FEEL his guilt. When this feeling of guilt is removed he KNOWS it. (☞ This feeling of guilt is removed by the blood of Christ applied to his conscience. The blood of Christ applied to his conscience from dead works, so that they may serve the living God.

When this is done, a man KNOWS it and the Spirit that God gives him is within him enabling him to feel like a child and call God father. THIS IS THE SCRIPTURAL EVIDENCE OF PARDON. No man can ever enjoy freedom unless he has known what it is to be a servant. Men are the servants of sin. They must know themselves to be servants of sin and feel its weight, before they can enjoy the freedom that Christ gives. THE EVIDENCE OF PARDON IS WITHIN A MAN, NOT WITHOUT HIM.

There is a vast difference between a written promise and the thing promised. The Holy Spirit and the remission of sins are promised; and if promised they are to be received; and if received, to be enjoyed. Now, must the believer content himself with the fact that the promise exists, or must he enjoy, be conscious of the thing promised, as possessed by himself? There is a reality in the consciousness of sin and when the conscience is cleansed from sin by the blood of Christ, there is reality in being thus cleansed. He that is cleansed from sin knows it. He is made free and feels free. This internal state, this CONSCIOUSNESS of freedom from sin, is the pith, the EXCELLENCE of the gospel. Why tell me that I am free if I am not to know it? Now this knowledge of freedom is to be ascribed, NOT TO ONE HAVING OBEYED A LAW, but to one having received THROUGH FAITH the thing promised.

Faith appropriates the promise, and it is the only appropriating principle. Faith and love are eternal and immutable principles underlying all the moral government of God. The first and great commandment is, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy mind, with all thy strength." The second is like it: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." This with faith remains immutable in all dispensations. Faith working through love has been, and still is, and always will be, the only justifying principle. By faith in Christ we appropriate to ourselves all that he has done for us. BY FAITH IN HIM we are made righteous before God and NOT BY OUR WORKS. ON THIS GROUND THE TRULY INTELLIGENT CHRISTIAN HAS ALWAYS STOOD AND WILL ALWAYS STAND. Hence, there is no glorying before God, for we are but the receivers of His grace.

I have, I hope, fairly and faithfully laid down the difficulties in the way of a union on the part of the Baptists

and Disciples. I now add that unless a union can be effected on Scriptural grounds, it will be better to remain as you are. You want no elements of discord among you. I therefore see that a union can be effected only in one way; and that is, by a candid confession, on the part of one or the other, of error, and an acceptance of sentiments such as will be in harmony with the whole truth of God. I must be permitted to say for myself that I have been with the Disciples for nearly forty years, and I know them. I have been thrown into very happy acquaintance with some Presbyterians. I understand them. ¶ I now have to say, AFTER studying the Scriptures for forty years, and AFTER having made a second translation of the New Testament, that the dispensation of the gospel is a dispensation of grace; as such it must be RECEIVED INTO THE HEART BY FAITH AND LOVE, NOT BY WORK OR WORKS. The gospel received into the heart by faith becomes an inward principle that subdues the whole man, and makes him a servant of God and of Jesus Christ. Through faith Jesus Christ is made to us from God, wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption. So, then, we have nothing to boast of as of ourselves; "but if any man glory in the Lord, let him glory." We have a right to glory in the Lord, but not in ourselves, nor because of anything we do or can do; for evident is it that we cannot bring God under obligation to us. He owes us nothing; we are debtors to him, for what we receive is grace.

I trust what I have written will be offensive to no one. I have judged no one, condemned no one. My faith is in God and his Son Jesus Christ, who has, THROUGH HIS BLOOD, WASHED ME from my sins. To him be honor, both now and through all ages. Amen H. T. ANDERSON.

Caroline Co., Va., Jan. 16, 1871.

In furnishing the above letter as part of my proof that Mr. Anderson had changed his mind on the design

of baptism, I have brought upon me the unrelenting ire of D. L. and his tribe.

But what was thought of the article at the time of its publication by those of the Reformation who had at least as much sense and sincerity, as my calumniators?

I give the following extracts from the Western Recorder, the first, of March 18th 1871, with introductory notes by the editor Dr. R. M. Dudley.

The following "wail" is from an editorial in the American Christian Review of Cincinnati, March, 7th touching the late delivery of one of the most gifted and honored sons on the roll of the "Current Reformation."

#### BRO. ANDERSON'S ARTICLE.

In another column we insert in full a long article of Bro. H. T. Anderson, copied from the Journal and Messenger, of February 1. We lay this document before our readers that they may see it for themselves and judge of its contents. The relation we have sustained to Bro. Anderson, the sympathy we have had for him in his extended labors in translating the New Testament, and our high regard for him make it extremely painful for us now to read this document and note its contents. We have seen such statements, representations and misrepresentations from sectarians; have reviewed them, explained where they misunderstood, exposed sophistry, and refuted what was false. ¶ But can this be necessary in the case of Bro. Anderson, a scholar, translator, and talented brother, of forty years' personal experience and observation among us? It certainly can not be demanded. ¶ Every intelligent reader can see the bearing and tendency of this document. That which makes the matter worse, is that it comes as an *authoritative statement from one who knows* the views of Baptists and Disciples in view of union nego-

tiations! This union movement is certainly bringing mortification and humiliation on us in abundance. Men who read such documents as some now appearing, will think the stale charge, "all sorts of doctrine by all sorts of preachers," true of us.

Are we, after all our stupendous achievements, to be humiliated, and abashed before the world and all sectarians, by our leading men running into a set of wranglers, on the plainest matters in the kingdom of God—"first principles?" Are we now to be mortified with a controversy among our learned men on the *design* of baptism. If the spirits of Campbell, Scott, &c., were to look out from among the dead, would they not be amazed that a controversy like this should be found in our journals?

Mr. Franklin could see the "*design*" of baptism involved in this letter.

A week or two after this the following extract appeared, which we clip also from the same paper, with the editorial introduction.

[Large caps and my emphasis. Please note the issue.]

Another "wail" from the Current Reformation. In the last number of the American Christian Review, Eld. Benjamin Franklin, the editor, takes his wayward brethren to task in a cautiously put article under the caption of "Late Discoveries." After descanting at length on the tendency among his people to worldly conformity, he proceeds to notice other deplorable facts equally manifest. But let the Ecclesiastical Sponsor speak for himself:

Some of the most thoroughly and clearly established matters, not of a speculative nature, but relative to the induction into the kingdom, or (which is the same) into Christ, on first principles, are now thrown open as unsettled, and the ground long maintained against all odds from without

not only given up by distinguished men among us, but *repudiated*. We will here instance two or three items:

1. BAPTISM FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS IS SQUARELY DENIED AND REPUDIATED, and long articles full of the same subtleties, sophistries and misrepresentations characterizing the articles of our opponents thirty or forty years ago, are found in support of the denial and repudiation.

2. It is squarely and stoutly maintained that the evidence of pardon is in us and not without—that is, that the evidence of pardon is in our feelings, or sensations in us, produced by the Spirit, not arising from any promise of God made by the Spirit, nor any testimony of the Spirit found in Scripture, but an impression of the Spirit produced in us in some other way.

Now, we ask the candid reader this plain question,—In publishing this letter of Mr. Anderson as part proof of my assertion that in his ripe old age he repudiated the proposition Mr. Lipscomb was trying to prove—"Baptism for—in order to the remission of sins"—did I lie, cheat and steal, and everything, deserving the unmitigated and protracted abuse heaped upon me by Mr. Lipscomb and his followers. And when I saw they had no regard for justice and truth, and had lost both judgment and mercy, and were determined to hang me as high as Haman, did I not do right to possess my soul in patience while they hurriedly erected the gallows on which I knew they, and not I, would at the right time be executed.

There was before us all the time a pending debate, and I thought that when that should come off, this mat-

ter could be restated just as it was at first, and that would be the time to properly settle the matter.

I communicated my plan to my counseling brethren, which they approved, and though they and many, many friends were continually taunted and tantalized about the Anderson letter, yet with me they bore it patiently, abiding the time to settle the account. As the Moody-Brents debate approached and they found they would have to swallow their charge of cowardice, they turned with fresh avidity on the Anderson letter—proposing to subscribe for the BAPTIST GLEANER and settle their subscription when I produced the promised letter. I saw a brother wearing a good hat which had been voluntarily promised him when I should meet Dr. Brents in debate, or when I should produce the Anderson letter. I did my best to draw Dr. Brents into Acts 2:38, so as to bring on the repetition of the old charge, and so that I might answer it. But I think Dr. Brents knew of the letter, and may have known when he gave his certificate, as he and all the rest ought to have known. He wouldn't draw in that direction at all. So finally, as late as I could defer the matter, I had to make an opportunity to "produce the much desired document."

Perhaps nothing in the history of polemics ever occurred, that proved more disastrous, destructive, discomfiting, damaging, and demoralizing to the opposition than did this long

pent-up lightning. The thunder bolts of truth which it contained, went crushing crackling and crashing through their awakened consciences.

I give so much of the letter as adheres to Acts 2:38, since they of the contrary part have made this so conspicuously the issue. I emphasize as before a few parts in large caps and italics. The italics as before is according to copy.

IS CHRIST THE SCAPEGOAT?  
OR, IS BAPTISM THE  
SCAPEGOAT?

BRO. ERRETI.

Here is a sharply defined difference. I have written it designedly. Acts 2:38 has not yet been interpreted. The words *eis aphesin* are connected with "be baptized," and endless confusion has been the consequence. The form of words, "baptism for the remission of sins," is current among us, and is the cause of great misunderstanding.

What is the sense of the words *eis aphesin*? Pardon me for saying that the form of words "BAPTISM FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS IS ESSENTIALLY ROMISH. Now, *eis aphesin* does not belong to "be baptized" (Acts 2:38) but to *Ieesou Christou* Jesus Christ. I shall give you proof of this that will satisfy you. Go to any Hebrew scholar in your city and request him to look into the Hebrew of Lev. 16:26. The word that is translated "Scapegoat" is *azazel*. Then take the Septuagint and read the same verse—the 26th—and you will find that the Seventy have translated the Hebrew *azazel*, which means "scapegoat" by the words *eis aphesin*, the very words found in Acts 2:38.

Now, if the Seventy rendered the Hebrew *azazel*, which means "scapegoat," by the words *eis aphesin*, then Peter must have known this, and he never could have intended to make

baptism the "scapegoat" that takes away sins. The mistake has been made by the church. It was not in Peter.

The scapegoat took (*erh' heautoo*) upon himself the iniquities of the people. Lev. 16:22 The sins of all the people were confessed over him, and put upon him, and he took them all away into the wilderness. Now, the two goats one slain, the other kept alive, represented Christ slain and risen. In Lev. 16, you will find the verb *hilaskesthai*, to make atonement, and the words *eis aphasis*. In the New Testament you find the words *hilasmos* and *aphesis*. These two complement each other. No shedding of blood, no *aphesis*, taking away of sins. I translate *aphesis* "taking away," as the scapegoat took away sins. Jesus shed his blood, *eis aphasis*, to take away sins, or as the removal of sins.

☞ With these facts before us, we can translate Acts 2:38, thus: Repent and be baptized, each one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ as the scapegoat of your sins; or, that he may take away your sins; or, for taking away your sins. Our preposition *for* is one of the most ambiguous of our small words. It has been made to translate five Greek prepositions *anti*, *dia*, *eis*, *hyper*, *peri*. That confusion of thought should arise from this, is evident. In order to present *eis aphasis* as an apposition, let me say that *eis* and an accusative often form a predicate, and an apposition; (thus: *esontai hoi duo, eis, mian sarka* (Matt. 19:5)—the two shall be one flesh. In 1 Cor. 15:45: *Egeneto ho protos anthropos Adam eis psuchean zoosan*—the first man, Adam, became a living soul: *ho eschatos Adam eis pneuma zoopoion*—the last Adam a life-giving Spirit. Other instances can be given. These are enough.

We now look at *eis* and an accusative forming an apposition. *Tetheika se eis phos ethnoon*—I have set thee as a light of the Gentiles; *tu einai se eis soterian*—that thou shouldst be salvation to the end of the earth. Here *eis phos* and *eis soterian* are in appo-

sition with *se*. In this way *eis aphasis* (Acts 2:38) stands in apposition with *Ieesou Christou*, and Jesus Christ is the scapegoat that takes away our sins. He is the light of the Gentiles, and salvation to the ends of the earth.

Now, I pray you, fail not to go to some Hebrew scholar, and see the fact stated above, with your own eyes; do not rely on my statement. *Eis aphasis* is the translation by the Seventy, of the Hebrew *azazel*, which in our English version, is scapegoat. As such is the fact, those words which have caused so much controversy must be construed with *Ieesou Christou*, and not with "be baptized."

☞ Why this fact has not been known is wonderful, since it is evident to any one that can read the original. This removes the OPPROBRIUM that has been on the church in all times—baptism for the remission of sins. But notice the word *for* in the sentence, "Faith is counted for righteousness." In the Hebrew it is: "He counted it to him righteousness." The Greek inserts an *eis* with *aphesis* for euphony. So in Acts 2:38, the *eis* with *aphesis* is as the *eis* with *dikaiosuneen*; it means nothing more than our word "as;" "He counted it to him as righteousness." Be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ as the *aphesis* of your sins, the means of removing your sins. John says, 1—2:2 "He is the propitiation for our sins."—The term *hilasmos* is abstract; so is *aphesis*. Jesus is as correctly the *aphesis* as the *hilasmos* of sins. He is the taking away of sins, the propitiation of sins. Let the abstract noun stand for the concrete, and the difficulty is removed, so far as the use of the word is concerned.

Let me now call attention to the meaning of the Hebrew *azazel*. Gesenius gives the sense thus; "The averter, expiator." *Averruncus* is given as one of the meanings, which signifies an averter of calamities. *Alexikakos* is also given, which means a defender against evils. Now, as this term *azazel* has been translated scapegoat, we see how the idea of

averting evil is connected with it. Sins were borne off by the scapegoat, and the calamities consequent on sins were averted. We have, most unfortunately, connected the one idea of pardon with the term *aphesis*. As already said, the term *aphesis* means a taking or sending away, and an averting of evil.—Peter said on Pentecost, "Save yourselves from this perverse generation." Jesus saved the believers from the wrath of God that came on that generation. [P] Let us again translate Acts 2:38; "Repent and be baptized each one of you in the name of Jesus Christ the remover of your sins." He is the true *azazel*, the expiator of sins, and the remover of sins.

See Lev. 14:10, where this same word *azazel* is translated by the terms *apompaios* and *apompeen*. These words have the double sense of sending away and averting calamities. [P] When we read the words of Peter, Be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, *eis aphasis*, the remover, the expiator of your sins, the defender against evils, how far does it raise us above the contention about the meaning of prepositions! Jesus is the true scapegoat, who takes away our sins, who is an expiator and defender. Let OTHERS fight about baptism for remission of sins; WE will take, accept of, Jesus as the real *aphesis*, the *azazel*, the Savior who takes upon himself our sins and bears them away; and we will preach to sinners him, and him crucified; and when they believe in him, will surely baptize every one of them.

NO ONE BELIEVES IN BAPTISM FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS. We have been charged with believing it, and we deny it, affirming that remission is found in the blood of Jesus. This is true—Jesus is the *hilasmos* and the *aphesis*; not baptism. I DO THEREFORE REJECT THE FORM OF WORDS, "BAPTISM FOR REMISSION OF SINS, AS UNSCRIPTURAL, AND AS TEACHING ERROR, AND CAUSING MISREPRESENTATION. I adopt "the blood of Jesus for the taking away

of sins" \* \* \* H. T. ANDERSON. [P] P. S.—MY PURPOSE IN WHAT I HAVE WRITTEN IS TO GIVE A CORRECT EXEGESIS OF ACTS 2:38. [S] When in Kentucky last fall I found that the proposition, "Baptism is for the remission of sins," was debated.

This form of words, so long in use, has been an offense. THERE IS EVIL IN IT. Not one of our people believes it. They must qualify it and explain it. We are constantly charged with baptismal remission, we deny it and again the charge is repeated. I DETERMINED TO REJECT IT. IT CANNOT BE DEFENDED BY SOUND EXEGESIS. IT IS UNSAFE. Remission of sins must be looked at as connected with sacrifice. In its very nature it stands connected with sacrifice, and we must so connect it. The words, "baptism for remission," convey an idea that not one among us believes.

I wrote to the Journal and Messenger, and designedly made a statement of difficulties in the way of union, stating the points sharply, that there might be a clear understanding on both sides. I ADOPTED THE VIEW THAT BAPTISM IS SYMBOLIC. I believe it but would not contend for it, inasmuch as I have something better.

I have looked at remission connected with sacrifice, and especially the sacrifice of atonement, as described in Lev. 16. I have always, when speaking of that subject, said that *aphesis* should be rendered "sending away," or taking away, inasmuch as the goat took the sins upon himself. This view, presented above, is not new to me; but the fact that the term *azazel* is rendered by *eis aphasis*, is too important in the exegesis of Acts 2:38 to be overlooked. It solves a difficult problem, and removes the odium attached to the words, "baptism for the remission of sins."

[P] I cannot accept of baptism as a "law of pardon," nor of any law of pardon. "Law of pardon" is not a Scriptural expression. I believe that the evidence of pardon is within us

—a conscience cleansed from sin by the blood of Jesus. There is the promise of pardon; but I wish to know that I have received the thing promised. But enough.

Let me add that the cause in which we are engaged is a noble one. To unite all Christians in one body is a noble purpose. I shall never yield that purpose. To accomplish it, we must preach Christ as the expiator and remover of sins. H. T. A.

In *Apostolic Times*, Lexington, Ky., March 23, 1871.

Seven years after the date of his translation, Mr. Anderson wrote the above letter, and Mr. McGarvey commented at length on it in *A. Times* of above date, and yet he writes Mr. Lipscomb he is "sure Mr. A's Translation was his latest deliberate utterance and that he never retracted or modified his view."

It is not in my heart to rejoice over vanquished foes. The children of the covenant of works will persecute those born after the Spirit as Isaac was. "Even so it is now" said Paul in Gal. 4:29 and so say we— even so it is now.

But remembering the words of our Lord Jesus who said—"Pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you," I close these pages with the earnest prayer that what I have written and caused herein to be published may be blessed of God to the conviction and conversion of all who may be so fortunate as to read and ponder the testimony of one of the greatest of men, who after using his mighty power in the dissemination of one of the most fatal systems of error that was ever embraced for the religion of Jesus, was at last by God's good grace delivered from darkness and brought to the glorious light and liberty of the children of God.

May the same great deliverance come to each and all who may read these pages. For which I do now, and shall hereafter, earnestly pray through Christ the Lord. Amen.

Fulton, Ky., March 1st 1887.

