

# Baptist Scholars

AND OTHERS

## Vindicated.

---

By J. B. MOODY, Nashville, Tenn.

---

NASHVILLE:  
BAPTIST BOOK HOUSE, 308 NORTH SUMMER STREET.  
1889.

Baptist Scholars

AND OTHERS

Vindicated.

---

By J. K. MOODY, Nashville, Tenn.

---

Published by  
LIVING BOOK DEPOT, 222 N. BROAD ST., NASHVILLE, TENN.

# BAPTIST SCHOLARSHIP

ON MEANING OF

## ACTS II: 38.

---

During the debate in Nashville Mr. J. A. Harding issued a circular and a tract purporting to give Baptist concessions to the doctrine he was advocating. Such great injustice is done our brethren that I determined to vindicate them and the truth in this pamphlet. The parts published by Mr. Harding that I have had opportunity to test by letters from the authors, or comparison of their works, I have copied and numbered them 1, 2, 3, 4, etc. The letters following are the author's explanation of the matter. Do they favor Campbellism or have they been misunderstood, and in some cases misrepresented? Read carefully and see. The italics are according to copy, but, to save comment, I have emphasized some words with large capitals. I will let Mr. Harding state the Baptist doctrine concerning these texts, and then the reader will see that Mr. Harding really knew our doctrine. In his debate with Mr. McGary, page 18, he says: "So Mr. Campbell, as late as 1823, held to the genuine Baptist notion that the *real pardon* is reached as soon as one believes, but that the *formal* declaration of the fact is set forth in baptism." This is repeated on page 27.

Then, if he quotes a Baptist author so as to represent him as teaching the opposite doctrine, especially if the next sentence after the quotation expressly explains this as the author's meaning, the quotation in that case is a misrepresentation, and willful, if it is repeated after frequent corrections. This is the case certainly in regard to Hackett, not only when he quotes Hackett on Acts 22: 16 direct, but also when

he quotes second-hand from Dr. Hovey, who quotes Hackett rightly. Why does Mr. Harding persist in stopping the quotation where it misrepresents Dr. Hackett, while the next sentence explains and shows it to be the old, genuine Baptist doctrine, though in new and strange phraseology. We will not keep silent while our honored dead are thus misquoted. Mr. Harding quotes Hackett from Hovey, but why did he not quote one more sentence, as Hovey did? Here is the way Mr. Harding quotes:

Dr. Hackett remarks, "This clause (*and wash away thy sins*) states a result of the baptism in language derived from the nature of the ordinance. It answers to *unto the forgiveness of sins*, 2: 38, *i. e.*, submit to the rite in order to be forgiven." Page 421.

The next sentence contains Dr. Hackett's explanation of these words, as follows:

In both passages baptism is represented as having this importance or efficacy because it is the SIGN of the repentance and faith which are THE conditions of salvation.

Hackett, Hovey and all the others that I have heard from hold to the old, genuine Baptist doctrine. We give only the parts of these letters that bear on the subject directly.

---

(1.) Prof. Harkness, of Brown University, Rhode Island:

In my opinion *eis* in Acts 2: 38 denotes *purpose*, and may be rendered 'in order to,' or, 'for the purpose of receiving,' or, as in our English version, *for*. *Eis aphesin hamartion* suggests the motive or object contemplated in the action of the two preceding verbs.

After reiterating the above as substantially correct, he closes as follows, which indicates his doctrinal view as a Baptist:

PROVIDENCE, May 18, 1889.

But we must not allow this interpretation to be held responsible for any false conclusions which any person may draw from it. It does not imply that baptism is regeneration or that it involves it. It gives baptism its proper place after repentance and faith. Yours very truly,  
A. HARKNESS.

---

(2.) Dr. J. M. Pendleton, in "Brief Notes on New Testament":

*For the remission of sins*: that the sins really remitted in the

exercise of repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ, may be formally and in symbol remitted in baptism.' On verse 40, 'save yourselves, by obeying the commands, Repent and be baptized.

BOWLING GREEN, KY., April 26, 1889.

REV. J. B. MOODY, Dear Bro.: Your letter has come to hand. In reply I have to say that great injustice is done to me by any man who represents me as believing that sins are *really* remitted in baptism. I have never written any such thing, for I have never believed it. My position has always been that the real remission of sins takes place when a sinner believes in Christ, and that there is only a *formal, symbolic* remission in baptism. I think it absurd to suppose that the real remission of sins is dependent on any external act. Baptism is an impressive symbol, but to be a symbol it must represent that which has already taken place. It can only symbolize remission of sins when sins have been *actually, really* remitted. In the course of a long life I have never taught anything in conflict with this view. If I am misrepresented by anybody I cannot help it; but I protest against the injustice done by such misrepresentation.

Yours in behalf of the truth, J. M. PENDLETON.

---

(3.) The *Baptist Watchman*, of Boston, the oldest Baptist paper in the world, gave "What must we do? That is, to be saved. Repent and be baptized. Baptism follows repentance as an appointed mode of avowing it openly, confessing Christ before men, *In the name of Christ*, by his authority. For the remission of your sins—in order to the forgiveness of sins."

BOSTON, April 27, 1889.

DEAR SIR: I would be much obliged if you would favor me with the date at which the sentence you quote appeared in the *Watchman*. I have no recollection of writing it or anything like it, and cannot assume to interpret its meaning.

Yours sincerely, L. E. SMITH.

As we could not furnish the date, we asked him if the following proposition expressed his doctrine, to which he replied:

OFFICE OF THE WATCHMAN, BOSTON, May 3, 1888.

REV. J. B. MOODY, Dear Brother: I have no hesitation in saying that the sentence cited by you, viz., "Baptism to a penitent believer is in order to obtain the pardon of past sins," was never written by me and DOES NOT EXPRESS MY OPINION.

Very truly yours, L. E. SMITH.

---

(4.) Prof. Foster, of Colby University, Maine:

Without a special examination of the passage in connection with others, in which like expressions occur, I should say that the word here has the force of 'unto,' 'in order to,' 'for

the sake of, indicating a result to be obtained, and that it connects the phrase, *aphesin hamartioon* with both the foregoing imperative verbs, alike grammatically considered, though on other grounds I should say especially with the first, since pardon is nowhere offered on condition of baptism alone, while it is on that of repentance. This is briefly my response to your query as I understand it.

COLBY UNIVERSITY, WATERTOWN, ME., July 9, 1888.

On looking it over, it seemed to me that I might have written it—except a wrong punctuation—the comma should be after the word “alike,” instead of before, as you give it, making it read, “it (*eis*) connects the phrase *aphesin hamartioon*, with both the foregoing imperative verbs alike, *grammatically considered*, though etc.” And in reply to your inquiry I would say that the statement substantially represents my opinion on the passage, only that (especially if I supposed it was to be put to a controversial use) I would make the latter part of it more distinct and emphatic. Indeed, as it now stands, with a rational regard to the force of the concluding clauses of the statement, I do not see how the Campbellite could find any support for his views therein. For it is stated that the connection of the phrase, *aphesin hamartioon*, is specially (in my view) with the first of the imperatives

To be brief, for I have not the time for a fuller presentation: Baptism was obviously regarded in the early days as the proper and natural, if not necessary sequence of repentance and faith in Christ; as an OUTWARD SIGN of the inward change; a confession of Christ; an act SIGNALIZING the passage from the old to the new life. Hence it is naturally associated in the injunction with the other, inward, ESSENTIAL act which is the real condition of the forgiveness of sin, and of which the OUTWARD act is the confession and pledge. With this view, the meaning of the apostle’s injunction might be thus expressed: “Repent ye (and in token of repentance be baptized), every one of you . . . unto the remission of your sins.”

With reference to other cases of the use of the word *eis* to which you refer, it is certainly true “that the objects in the accusative antedated the motion of the verb,” and, in a sense, the idea of “retrospection” is involved. But, you will observe, that I feel no necessity for appealing to this in the case under notice. Prepositions are among the most difficult parts of speech to deal with in translation from one language to another, especially in their METAPHORICAL uses. JOHN B. FOSTER.

(5.) And the *Journal and Messenger*, a Baptist paper published at Cincinnati, says of Mr. Wilmarth’s exegesis, that it is by no means new, “it is simply a more extended leading out than that of Dr. Hackett, which has always been accepted by Baptists, being indeed much older than he. It is true a few individuals have tried, but without success, to establish a different meaning of the preposition - *on account of* the remission of sins.”

The *Journal and Messenger*, of Cincinnati, Ohio, gave “*Unto the remission of sins - in order to the remission of sins.*”

CINCINNATI, O., April 25, 1889.

DEAR BRO.: Yours just at hand takes me quite by surprise. I am very glad that you wrote me, for it affords me occasion to call your attention to the true position of the *Journal and Messenger*. I am not aware of having written the paragraph which you quote. I am quite sure that I never did write it, and if I ever did, I repudiate it now and henceforth. You do not say, because you probably do not know, the date of the paper in which it is reputed to have occurred. I cannot think that it has appeared since I have had control of the paper, now nearly thirteen years. I enclose clippings from our issues of Jan. 3d, Jan. 31st, ult., and April 18th (last week), to show what is my position on the question. You may find in these clippings something suggestive for your argument. I have written several short articles of late bearing in the same direction, but would find it difficult to lay hands upon them now. I have found that, without formally stating the case, Dr. Broadus holds the same view as to the meaning of the passages in question.

I think that Baptists have made a mistake, in that they have accepted the false interpretation of the preposition *eis*. The truth is that about one-half of the time when it was used it meant something else than into, or in order to. Turn for yourself to the passages cited, and I think that you will agree with me that they do not mean either *into* or *in order to*.

I understand now that the writer in the *Apostolic Guide*, to whom I refer in the shorter slip, is no other than Professor McGarvey, though the article did not look as though written by him. If he wrote it, the argument may be regarded as so much the stronger in our favor, for his article was weak and passionate rather than learned and strong. If McGarvey has said his say, their case is surely gone, as it certainly is in any case; for nothing is more evident than that John did *not* baptize *in order* that sin might be remitted. And no more did the disciples, at pentecost, baptize for—*in order to*—the remission of sins.

Let us plant ourselves just here, and Campbellism is gone.

Hoping that you will find something to please you in the slips enclosed and that you will vindicate the truth in your debate, I am very truly yours,  
G. W. LASHER.

(6.) Prof. J. R. Boise, of Southern Baptist [Morgan Park] Theological Institute: "I render *eis* with the following accusative into (rather than unto) the remission of sins, the clause denoting the end in view, and the result attained."

47 STRONG PLACE, BROOKLYN, N. Y., May 18, 1888.

MY DEAR SIR:

I have written two articles for *The Standard* on Acts 2: 38, and I wish you could read them. You can then judge whether the Campbellites can get any comfort from them. I will write the publisher of *The Standard* and ask him to send you a copy of the last article. You will note the points, *repent, be baptized UPON THE NAME (or IN THE NAME) OF JESUS CHRIST*. This is FAITH in him. Three points, *repentance, faith in Christ, baptism*; then two points, *remission of sins, the gift of the Holy Spirit*.

All Biblical scholars (of any standing), German, French,

English, American, of all denominations, interpret the words, *in the name* (or *on the name*) of *Jesus Christ* as above.

J. R. BOISE.

OAK PARK, COOK COUNTY, ILL., April 24, 1889.

MY DEAR BROTHER:

AM SORRY I have't a copy of my article to send you. Nothing could be more opposed to the Campbellite doctrine.

The clause overlooked or underrated by the Campbellites is, *upon the name of*, etc. What does this clause signify? Ans. *Faith*; *faith in Jesus Christ as a Savior*. We have then, *repentance and faith*—the inward experience; *baptism*, the PUBLIC PROFESSION of this inward experience, the SYMBOL of death to the former life and resurrection to the new life.

J. R. BOISE.

(7.) The Chicago *Standard* recommends Wilmarth's article to those who are interested in the subject and says: "We very much fear that there is a tendency, even amongst our own people, to look upon the ordinance (baptism) 'as simply a form of Christian profession and of admission to membership in the church. It must not be forgotten that this is not that view of it which apostolic teaching makes prominent. Obedience in this particular is, in that teaching, directly associated with spiritual blessings, such as the remission of sins.'" \* \* "We believe that there is a real and a rich spiritual benefit which believers are to find, and always ought to find, in this act of obedience."

Dr. Smith, of the *Standard*, in reply to the above, is too lengthy for insertion here. We give his conclusion, which covers the ground:

\* \* \* Why then is baptism mentioned at all? Not because it is necessary, in order to salvation, since our Lord's words imply the direct contrary; nor necessary to the remission of sins, as Peter must be interpreted to mean, if we make him teach in harmony with the commission as a preacher of the gospel. Baptism is mentioned because this first act of obedience is essential to right Christian position. \* \* In its SYMBOLISM it is a wonderful OBJECT lesson, both ILLUSTRATING and enforcing cardinal doctrines of our religion."

We will add that the *Standard* is opposed to BAPTISM receiving Campbellite immersion. Then how can he endorse it?

To show how Mr. Harding has garbled Dr. Hovey, we put in brackets [ ] beginning with dark type the parts quoted by Mr. Harding, and we present the connection so the reader may see it as it appears in the book. We emphasize in large caps a few words to save comment. Remember [ ] is what Mr. H. quotes and the other is what he left out.

(8.) In neither of these passages is baptism represented as a



means of regeneration, i. e., of the work of the Holy Spirit in giving a new life to the soul. (a) The first of them reads as follows: [**Repent**, and be baptized every one of you in (or upon) the name of Jesus Christ, unto the remission (forgiveness) of your sins. (Acts 2, 38., rev. version.) Here repentance and baptism are represented as leading to the forgiveness of sins.] We understand repentance to be a voluntary turning of the soul from the exercise of unbelief to the exercise of belief, and from a paramount love of self and sin to a paramount love of God and holiness; while baptism is the prescribed **SYMBOL, SIGN** or **EXPRESSION** of that inward change. [**The two are**, therefore, properly united in our thought; but one as the essential, inward change, and the other as a divinely required confession or **SIGN** of that change. This view of the relation of baptism to repentance or faith is confined by the 41st verse below: "They that gladly received his word were baptized."] Rut there is no hint in these verses of **ANY** connection between baptism and regeneration by the spirit of God; no suggestion even that the **CHANGE** called repentance was conditioned on the rite of baptism. (b) [**Of course** there is no such thing possible as a literal washing away of sins.] A removal of sins from the soul by bathing the body in water is **ABSURD**. [**But** there is such a thing as forgiveness of sins, and this may be described **FIGURATIVELY** as washing them away, so that henceforth the soul may be "clean" from the guilt or stain of sin. Dr. Hackett remarks that this clause (*and wash away thy sins*) states a result of the baptism in language derived from the **NATURE** of the ordinance. It answers to unto forgiveness of sins in Acts 2: 38, i. e., submit to the rite in order to be forgiven.] In **BOTH** passages baptism is represented as having this importance or efficacy, because it is the **SIGN** of the repentance and faith which are **THE** conditions of salvation. "Hovey, Page 420." Why did Mr. Harding skip this last? Why does he persist in doing it?

Eph. 5: 26, repeats the idea of "cleansing" (i. e., from sins) which, as has been shown, is sometimes a **FIGURATIVE** expression for forgiveness of sins. \* \* \* This accords with the view that it refers to the forgiveness of sins upon repentance rather than to the implanting of a holy principle of life and sanctification in the soul. The two acts are doubtless coincident in time, but are distinguishable in fact and thought.

(2.) That here, as in the passages already examined, baptism—in case that is meant by "the laver of water"—is used as a **SIGN** or **SYMBOL** of conversion, and is spoken of as securing that which is secured by conversion; that is, by the turning of the soul to God for pardon and peace. In other words, the **SIGN** is here put for the **THING SIGNIFIED**; the **RITUAL** act of confession is put for the **SPIRITUAL** act which it **REPRESENTS**. \* \* \* At all events, there is nothing in this passage to show that Paul conceived of baptism as the medium in and through which divine life is conveyed by the Holy Spirit to the soul. Page 421.

On John 3: 5, and Titus 3: 5, he says: If this passage could be interpreted by itself without regard to other statements, we

should be ready to adopt the latter view as correct and say that there is here no reference to baptism. But bearing in mind the other passages, we accept the former view as probably correct, and believe that Paul had in mind baptism as REPRESENTING and CONFESSING the divine change called regeneration.

[Hence he teaches that men are saved by an outworking, obedient life, given and preserved by the Holy Spirit.] (c) The other passage, John 3: 5, has been examined in the commentary, but we may properly add a few remarks in this place. (1) There can be no reference in this passage to Christian baptism in distinction from John's baptism. For neither this gospel nor any other gives us reason to think that Christ had yet administered the rite by the hands of his disciples, or or had imparted to it any spiritual efficacy which it had not when administered by John.

If, then, he meant to speak in language intelligible to Nicodemus, he must have referred to either John's baptism or to a well understood figurative sense of the term water. He could not have referred to a rite that would begin to be used after two or three years. (2) As an expression, being "born of water and of spirit" is clearly not synonymous with being "born of the spirit" by means of water. For by the former the relation of these two sources of the new life to each other is not pointed out, while by the latter it is definitely stated. [Taking the two sources separately, we may say that being "born of water" (baptized) must signify being cleansed from sins or forgiven, while being "born of spirit" cannot signify less than being ingenerated, if we may use the word, with a new and holy principle of life by the Spirit of God.] It is not, therefore, surprising that Jesus alludes to baptism in the briefest manner, while he dwells with special emphasis upon the work of the Spirit. (3) We do not hesitate to say that it is IRRATIONAL to THINK of "water" as holding the same relation to the new birth as that held by the Holy Spirit.

A material substance cannot be supposed to effect a moral change. It may naturally enough *signify* a moral or spiritual change, but that is all. Dead matter cannot be a spring of moral power to the soul; and it is almost equally difficult to conceive of it as a physical medium of the Spirit.

Having shown that the principal texts on which men have founded the doctrine that the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration is mediated by the water of baptism, need not be supposed to teach that doctrine. We will now look at certain representations of scripture which are manifestly inconsistent with that doctrine. Page 422.

Peter looked upon the extraordinary gift of the Spirit to Cornelius, his kinsman, and near friends, as conclusive evidence that they might properly be baptized. \* \* \* These passages make it certain that according to the teaching of John, of Christ, and of the apostles, the function of baptism is not to *originate* the new life of faith, but to represent the origin of it; to portray and confess the entrance of a human soul, through repentance and faith, produced by the Spirit of God, in the light of divine truth, upon a life of consecration and obedience. It is an ordinance that takes the mind of a believer back to the

moment of conversion, that he may confess before men the change which then took place, by the grace of God, in his spiritual state.

The following note from W. P. Throgmorton was addressed to several of the most eminent teachers of Greek, and the following replies were received. Here is his note :

MT. VERNON, ILL., ———, 188—.

PROFESSOR OF GREEK :

Please give me the meaning of "*eis*" in each of the following New Testament passages :

Matt. 3 : 11 : I indeed baptize with water (*eis*) repentance. Did John baptize the people in order to get them to repent ? or with reference to repentance already taken place ?

2. Matt. 12 : 41 : The men of Ninevah will rise in the judgment with this generation and shall condemn it, because they repented at (*eis*) the preaching of Jonah. [See Book of Jonah.] Did the Ninevites repent in order that Jonah might preach ? or as a result of his preaching ?

3. Acts 2 : 38 : Then Peter said unto them, repent (ye) and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for (*eis*) the remission of sins, etc. Do the phrases "in the name" and "for the remission," grammatically modify both "repent" and "be baptized," or only the latter ? On the presumption that whoever repents *has* remission of sins so soon as his repentance is consummated, were these parties to be baptized in order to obtain remission or with reference to remission already received.

4. Rom. 6 : 3 : Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into (*eis*) Jesus Christ were baptized into (*eis*) his death ? Does baptized (*eis*) his death mean baptized in order to obtain his death or with reference to his death already taken place ?

Does "*eis*" in any or all the foregoing passages point to a thing already done ?

Please answer briefly under the figures indicated below, and by so doing you will greatly oblige an inquirer after truth.

Respectfully, W. P. THROGMORTON.

Prof. W. W. Humphries, of the University of Virginia, replies :

The questions which you sent me on the subject of baptism are not to be decided by Greek scholarship, but by a thorough study of theological questions with which I am not familiar.

Wm. F. Swahlem, of DePauw University, (Methodist) replies :

1. I understand the repentance as PRIOR to the baptism.
2. Evidently their repentance was a RESULT of Jonah's preaching.
3. The punctuation would favor their modifying the latter—

though it might be claimed the phrases grammatically modify both.

4. With reference to death ALREADY taken place.

5. It would seem to refer to something PRECEDING.

Prof. S. F. Nicolassen, Southwestern Presbyterian University :

The *rite* and the *reality* are to be distinguished. The *reality* is the bringing of the sinner, by the Holy Spirit, *into* a state of repentance and then *into* a state of remission of sins. The water belongs merely to the rite, is SYMBOLICAL.

1. "Into." See above.

2. "At" does very well. The idea is that of motion toward, in a FIGURATIVE sense.

3. The phrases modify only the latter. This is determined, however, rather by the sense than by the syntax. Explanations above—"into."

4. "Into" in a FIGURATIVE sense, bringing the sinner into the sphere and influence of that death.

5. "Into" or "towards" expressing motion in a FIGURATIVE sense, will, I think, cover all the cases cited. This motion may refer to a thing ALREADY DONE, the person being brought into relation to it.

Dr. John A. Broadus, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary :

1. I baptize you *eis*, with reference to repentance, may mean (1) as in question 2, with reference to repentance, as OCCASIONING the baptism, or (2) as the thing SIGNIFIED by the baptism, or (3) it may mean in order to repentance; that is, in order to the MANIFESTATION of a repentance ALREADY begun. He certainly did not baptize till after they had essentially repented and so confessed. I should prefer (1) or (2), because (3) puts a peculiar sense upon the term repentance.

2. Jonah assuredly preached BEFORE their repenting, and his preaching OCCASIONED the repenting. They repented *eis* with reference to the preaching, and the history shows that it was with reference to the preaching as the occasion. The idea that they repented in order that Jonah might preach is utterly contradicted by the facts, and cannot possibly be meant.

3. You may understand *eis* unto, with reference to remission, as connected (1) with repent, and let every one be baptized, in which case it is like, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." It is the believing that brings into the condition of salvation, and the believing is declared by being baptized; so with repent and be baptized. (2.) You may take unto remission as connected (like upon the name) only with "let every one be baptized," in which case it may give the occasion of the baptizing (as in 2), or else the end or aim of the baptizing; but this last will bring the passage in conflict with the general teachings of the Scripture, and so it ought to be rejected by a believer in inspiration.

4. I greatly prefer (with Fritzsche and Meyer) baptized unto Jesus Christ; baptized unto his death as the thing SIGNI-

FIED by the baptism. This exactly fits Paul's arguments. The true believer will not continue in sin that grace may abound, for at the beginning of his Christian course his very baptism SIGNIFIED that he was dead to sin, and risen to a new life.

5. It certainly does in question 2, almost certainly in question 4, most probably in question 1, quite possibly in question 3.

Prof. M. L. D'Ooge, University of Michigan :

*Eis* with reference to ; the expression ' in the name ' and " for the remission " are generally, and I think correctly, taken as modifying only the verb be baptized. Baptism is the SIGN and SYMBOL of the remission.

This is enough. Comment is unnecessary. These men are in the old Baptist line. The ordinances are rites, not realities, figures and not the facts, symbols and not the things symbolized.

We add from Dr. Kirtley's Design of Baptism Appendix a few of the many concessions to this view by eminent Baptist and Pedobaptist scholars. So in this we claim to be supported by the recognized scholarship of the age. "Immersion to a penitent believer in order to obtain pardon of past sins," was invented by Mr. Campbell and his coadjutors, and believed by none others, and thank God they are rapidly growing out of it.

Dr. Brown, of Edinburgh :

To be baptized into Christ is, I apprehend, just equivalent to be united or intimately related to Christ by that faith of which a PROFESSION is made in baptism.

Dr. Samuel W. Lynd :

Our putting on Christ in baptism is an OPEN, FORMAL entrance into the kingdom of Jesus Christ. We then PUBLICLY renounce our former life, and profess to commence a new life. We ASSERT to the world in this act that we die to sin and rise to a life of holiness.—*Design of Baptism*, pages 25-26.

Carson on Rom. 6 :

How, then, are we dead? By faith in Christ we are dead. But in baptism *this truth is exhibited in FIGURE*: \* \* The death in baptism is a figurative death, founded on the real death by faith. \* \* The Christian has a *real* death, burial, and resurrection with Christ by faith. He has all these also in baptism by FIGURE. Baptism is a *proof* of death, because it has no meaning otherwise.

Conybeare and Howson :

It is needless to add that baptism was (unless in exceptional

cases) administered by immersion, the convert being plunged beneath the surface of the water, to represent his death to the life of sin, and then raised from this momentary burial, to represent his resurrection to the life of righteousness.

Luther, quoted by Conant, says :

The mode of baptizing ought, therefore, to correspond to the SIGNIFICATION of baptism, so as to set forth a sure and full SIGN of it.—*Meaning and Use of Baptizein*, pages 160-161.

Matthies :

It is, indeed, to be lamented that this rite, as being one which most aptly sets before the eyes the SYMBOLIC significance of baptism, has been changed.

McKnight, *Commentary on Romans 6 : 3* :

In our baptism, have been represented EMBLEMATICALLY as put to death with him.

Prof. Lange :

The plunging under water REPRESENTS death, and rising out of it the resurrection to a new life. A more striking SYMBOL could not be chosen.

Archbishop Tillotson :

Anciently, those who were baptized were immersed and buried in the water, to REPRESENT their death to sin; and then did rise up out of the water, to SIGNIFY their entrance upon a new life.

Conant, speaking of the "obligation to translate the word" *baptizein*, says :

The act which it describes was chosen for its adaptation to SET FORTH, in lively SYMBOLISM, the ground thought of Christianity. The change in the state and character of the believer WAS TOTAL. \* \* These related ideas, comprehending in their references the whole work and fruit of redemption, were both figured by the immersion of the believer in water. In respect to both, it was called a burial.

SECTION 1. McKnight, *Commentary on Rom. 6 : 4* :

In like manner the baptism of believers is emblematical of their own death, burial, and resurrection. Perhaps, also, it is a commemoration of Christ's baptism.

Dr. Chalmers :

Jesus Christ by death underwent this sort of baptism—even immersion under the surface of the ground, whence he soon emerged again by his resurrection. We, by being baptized into his death, are conceived TO HAVE made a similar translation; in the act of descending under the water of baptism, TO HAVE resigned an old life, and in the act of ascending, to emerge into a second or new life.—Everts as above, page 10.

Prof. Turney :

This is symbolically presented in baptism as the washing away of sin.

Chase :

Thus there is a figurative washing away of sins, a putting off of the body of sinful propensities, and, as it were, a depositing of it in the grave.

Carson :

It is absurd and ridiculous to suppose that an ordinance can wash away sin in any other than a figurative sense.

Prof. J. E. Farnam :

Of such peculiar "idiomatic expressions" the passages already quoted as teaching the dogma of baptismal remission of sin (viz.: Mark 1: 4, Acts 2: 38, Acts 22: 16) are examples. The idiom of the Hebraic Greek, of which these passages are literal translations, consists in applying to a declaratory rite a term which properly designates that of which the rite is merely declaratory or symbolical. An example of this idiom is furnished by Christ himself in his language to the leper whom he had healed, as is recorded by Mark in chap. 1: 40-44: \* \* Here Christ first cleanses [cures] the leper, and then directs him to go to the priest and offer for his cleansing the things commanded by Moses. The law of Moses respecting lepers is contained in the 13th and 14th chapters of Leviticus; where the priest is required, first, to examine, with great care and the closest scrutiny, the person who supposes himself already healed and free from the disease; and if, after such examination, the priest believes him "clean"—*i. e.*, wholly free from leprosy—he is required, for the benefit of the applicant, to perform the rite of cleansing. Nothing is plainer than that this ritual cleansing or healing was merely declaratory of the cleansing or healing which had been effected previously to the examination of the applicant by the priest. This peculiar phraseology pervades the ritual language of the Levitical law as expressed in the Septuagint version; and it would naturally be employed by the New Testament writers when speaking of the Christian rite of baptism. Hence we need not be surprised at hearing Mark speak of John baptizing for the remission of sins, when the sins had already been remitted, if Christ himself speaks of cleansing a man already clean. Both expressions are the same idiom applied to different subjects.

Dr. Adam Clark :

But as they receive baptism as an EMBLEM of death, in voluntarily going under the water, so they receive it as an EMBLEM of the resurrection and eternal life in coming up out of the water.

Thayer, under *Baptize*, in his Great Lexicon, says :

An immersion in water performed as a SIGN of the removal of sins.

Presbyterian *Confession of Faith* :

Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church, but also to be unto him a

SIGN and seal of the covenant of grace, of his engraving into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life.

*Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England:*

Baptism is not only a SIGN of profession and mark of difference whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but is also a SIGN of r-egeneration or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are VISIBLY SIGNED and sealed.—*Design of Baptism*, page 188.

---

## CAMPBELLITE CONCESSIONS.

---

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 cannot 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 cannot 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 cannot 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 cannot 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 of vital importance—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 the 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 visibis gratiæ 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 remains 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 justification 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 Baptist. 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 County, Va., January 16, 1871.

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

BRO. ERRETT:

Here is a sharply defined difference. I have written it designedly. Acts 2: 38 has not yet been interpreted. The words *eis aphasis* 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 aphasis*? Pardon me for saying that the form of words "BAPTISM FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS" IS ESSENTIALLY ROMISH. Now, *eis aphasis* 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 aphasis*, the very words found in Acts 2: 38.

Now, if the Seventy rendered the Hebrew *azazel*, which means "scapegoat," by the words *eis aphasis*, 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 (*eph' hawtou*) 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 psucheen 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. *Tetheikē se eis phos ethnoon*—I have set thee as a light of the Gentiles; *tou einai se eis soterrian*—that thou shouldst be salvation to the end of the earth. Here *eis phos* and *eis soterrian* are in apposition with *se*. In this way *eis aphesin* (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 aphesin* 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 *aphesin* for euphony. So in Acts 2: 38, the *eis* with *aphesin* is as the *eis* with *dikai osuneen*; 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. *Alexitakos* 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. 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 *apomppeen*. These words have the double sense of sending away and averting calamities. When we read the words of Peter, Be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, *eis aphesin*, the remover, the expiator of your sins, the defender against evils, how far does it raise us above the con-

tention 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 THE 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. S.—MY PURPOSE IN WHAT I HAVE WRITTEN IS TO GIVE A CORRECT EXEGESIS OF ACTS 2: 38. 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 point 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.”

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.

AN OPEN LETTER TO BRO. MCGARVEY.

DEAR BROTHER:

I am now ready to come to baptism for remission of sins. If the believer who has confessed Christ, as having died for his sins or for him as a sinner, is in God's judgment, dead with Christ to sin, or has died with him, as a sinner, then there is the strictest propriety or fitness in burying such a one in baptism or in water. And if such believer has already risen with Christ in God's judgment of him, then his resurrection out of the water, in which he was just now buried, DECLARES the fact. But if the believer has not in God's judgment died with Christ unto sin, and risen with Christ out of death into life or the state of justification, then the whole thing seems to be an acted falsehood. For the believer represents himself, not as dying with Christ, but as already dead with him; for there is no fitness in burying a living man! But if the ordinance of baptism kills the sinner to sin, and then raises him from the dead, then it is the atonement itself, the reason why God pardons sin. And the mystery of transubstantiation envelops it as a thick cloud.

But in baptism the believer ACTS OUT his faith in God's judgment of him, as having already died in Christ, and risen out of the dead with him. And the remission of sins is not for, and in consideration of the burial in the water, and the resurrection out of it, but in consideration of the fact that God has judged the believer to have died to sin in Christ, and to have risen with him out of death into justification of life.

\* \* \* \* \*

The believing sinner is not pardoned for the sake of being baptized in water, but for the sake of what he believes, and what he is as a believer in Christ, dead, and risen in him. "Because we thus judge that one died for all; therefore all (who believe) died" in him, and rise into justification of life. We rest and have peace in these judgments of God. The ordinance is a perpetual reminder of these eternal judgments of God of the believer in Christ.

My brother, I beg of you to think of these truths; to search for them and not for heresy. Yours in the faith of Jesus,

J. W. COX.

Lexington, Ky., November 6, 1883.



In another issue he says :

As to baptism I cannot enter upon it, except with a few thoughts. You quote the 6th of Romans, that "we are baptized into his death." "We are buried with him through baptism into death." Now, venerable brother, are these expressions to be taken literally? Is Christ baptized with the believer into DEATH every time a believer is baptized? We know that he is not, and we know the believer is not baptized into death, in the literal sense. Wilson renders the phrase, "we have been entombed with him by the baptism, into that death." And surely we do know that this language cannot, and ought not, to be interpreted literally. \* \* The secret of holding Christ and the believer as inseparably one in death and in resurrection, is that God has judged them to be one and inseparable. This ANTEDATES baptism, or the believer in representing himself to be dead would act a falsehood. It is never said that we die to sin in baptism; but on the contrary we have died in Christ's body, and therefore we are buried in the ordinance. We are buried because we have died in Christ, and rose in him. \* \* We must not confound the METHOD of teaching with the things taught. "This is my body;" so the ordinance is called death because it REPRESENTS it. It assures our heart of perfect deliverance in Christ.—*J. W. Cox, in Apostolic Times.*

---

Mr. McGarvey, in the *Apostolic Guide* of May 17th, 1889, gives the substance of his lecture to his theological class on John 3. We copy the following, which shows a growing towards the light of reason and Revelation. The *Christian Standard* of Cincinnati, the *Christian Evangelist* of St. Louis, and the *Apostolic Guide* are the leading papers of the Reformation, and they are all growing grandly out of the shades of Campbell. We could make many extracts, but let the following suffice :

We also agree in affirming that to be born of water and the Spirit, is to undergo the change wrought within by the Holy Spirit, and to be baptized. At this point one of you put the question, "Are any unbaptized persons in the kingdom?" I answer they are not; and they cannot be.

Of course, life-long neglect of baptism is a sin, being neglect to obey a divinely appointed ordinance; and if persons who are guilty of this neglect are saved it will be because this sin among others is forgiven. No man can say with absolute certainty that it will be forgiven, but I sincerely hope that in the case of all godly persons it will be. \* \* At this point one of you replied: "I do not see how you say you hope for it; for hope is made up of desire and expectation; and though you desire it, you cannot expect it." I answered, I both desire and expect it. When I think of men and women who love God devotedly, and

show that they do by lives of piety and self-sacrifice, as many unimmersed persons have done, I would not say for my right arm that that they will be lost. On the contrary, I EXPECT THEM TO BE SAVED, and I base my expectation on the mercy of God, who, I am sure, will forgive and save all who thus love and serve him, notwithstanding the imperfection of their obedience. The best of men have much to be forgiven.

For further facts and concessions see Moody-Harding debate.