

JUNE 15, 1906.

Vol. II., No 2

THE
Bible Tract Series

EDITED BY A. F. DUGGER.

BAPTISM,

By J. T. WILLIAMSON

Appleton City, Mo.

JR.
P. KIESZ
SOUTH DAKOTA

THE BIBLE TRACT SERIES.— A BI-MONTHLY PUBLICATION DEVOTED TO THE INVESTIGATION OF BIBLE TRUTHS.

TERMS : 25 CENTS PER YEAR.

PUBLISHED BY
THE CHURCH OF GOD PUBLISHING HOUSE,
STANBERRY, MO.

60

Baptism.

THIS as well as every other command enjoined upon mankind is not only essential and important in its administration, but manifests a marked degree of divine wisdom. And it is our prerogative to obey, not in the letter (be baptized, being blind to its purpose) but in the spirit. Therefore it is highly necessary that we have a proper requisite of faith, not only believing it to be commanded by God, but exercising faith in the "operation of God." Col. 2: 12 John's baptism was identical in mode with the baptism commanded afterward by Christ; both were immersion in water. Compare Matt. 3: 16 with Acts 8: 38. The purposes were also identical; John's baptism before the crucifixion was "for the remission of sins." Mark. 1: 4. Peter commanded it after the crucifixion "for the remission of sins." Acts 2: 38. See also Acts 22: 16.

Notwithstanding the similarity of the two baptisms, both in mode and purpose, Paul would not honor John's baptism after the crucifixion, because the proper requisite of the candidate's faith at the time John's baptism was administered was insufficient in Paul's day. "Then said Paul John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him (Christ) which should come after him (John). When they heard this they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Acts 19: 4, 5. John's baptism, in going down into the water and being brought up out of the water, typified the death, burial and resurrection of Christ as a future event: while

the baptism instituted by Christ after the crucifixion, Mark 16: 16, in going down into the water and being brought up out of the water commemorates the death, burial and resurrection of Christ as a past event.

The candidate for John's baptism exercised prospective faith therefore John's baptism ceased when the antitype came (resurrection of Christ.) After the event occurred Christ re-established the rite, requiring retrospective faith of the candidate. Therefore as faith marks the distinction between the two baptisms, Paul would not accept John's baptism on that ground, but re-baptized them. Acts 19: 4, 5. We see the vital importance of the candidate for baptism being well informed in this sacred rite.

To this end we submit this little tract, hoping the blessing of God may crown our efforts.

BAPTISM DEFINED.

To properly understand the English word baptism, as mentioned in the scriptures, we must understand the full meaning of the original word from which it was translated; because our language is principally derived from other languages; modern customs are also adding new phases of interpretation to our language. E. g.: Should a religious organization institute a custom of sprinkling saw-dust on the candidate's head for baptism, and this custom become popular, it would be admitted into our language. Hence we see the word baptism would embrace more than it originally did.

To-day the custom of sprinkling and pouring water upon the candidate's head for baptism has found admission into our language. Therefore we must define the original words *bapto* and *baptizo* and other related words. The Old Testament was first written in Hebrew; the New Testament was written in the Greek. Ptolemy Philadelphus, king of Egypt, about the year 280 B. C.

translated the Old Bible from the Hebrew into the Greek. This was called the Septuagint because he employed seventy-two interpreters to assist in the translation.

Ptolemy Philadelphus thought that *bapto* was a proper word in the Greek to represent a word in the Chaldee, meaning in English to dip into, immerse, etc., but never meaning to sprinkle or to pour.

We will now give reference in the Old Bible in which the Septuagint has *bapto* and other members of the same relation, and see how King James has the same word translated into English. "The priest shall dip [*bapsei*] his finger in the blood seven times before the Lord, before the sanctuary." Lev. 4: 6. "And a clean person shall take hyssop and dip [*bapsei*] in it water and sprinkle it upon the tent." Num. 19: 18. "He put forth the end of the rod that was in his hand, and dipped [*ebapsen*] it in the honey-comb." 1 Sam. 14: 27. "Yet shalt thou plunge [*ebapsen*] me in the ditch and mine own clothes shall abhor me." Job 9: 31. "And it came to pass on the morrow he took a thick cloth, and dipped [*ebapsen*] it in water, and spread it on his face, so that he died." 2 Kings 8: 15.

The word *baptizo* in the Greek occurs in 2 Kings 5: 14. "Then went he down and dipped [*ebapisato*] himself seven times in Jordan." Also in Mark 7: 4 we have the translation of *baptizo*; in that place they translate *baptisontai*, wash; and in the same verse they translate *baptismous*, washing; also in the eighth verse of the same chapter and in Hebrews 9: 10. The noun *baptismos* is rendered washing, many like references may be given, but I think this sufficient. The prophecy in Isa. 52: 15, "So shall he (Christ) sprinkle many nations" has no reference to Christian baptism whatever. The word "sprinkle" here in the Septuagint is *thoumasontai*, a Greek word meaning to startle, to surprise,

cause to wonder. The word *bapto* when it occurs in the classic Greek is generally rendered to dip, but never translated to sprinkle nor to pour.

CONSCIENCE NOT A GUIDE.

Some contend that as it is sometimes translated wash, that its sacred use means to purify, to cleanse, etc., and therefore the motive satisfies the requirement without respect to the explicit performance of the act. But this assumption is utterly devoid of any inspired authority. No doubt Cain thought that his grain offering was just as valuable as Abel's, but the firstling of Abel slain upon the altar typified Christ's death upon the cross, while Cain's offering had no such significance and therefore was rejected: likewise neither sprinkling nor pouring commemorates or in any sense repeats the burial and resurrection of Christ as Paul says baptism does. "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." Rom. 6: 5. Therefore the conscience is apt to be a blind guide in such matters. Is our faith strong enough to make a wrong right? God says, "Your ways are not my ways, neither are your thoughts my thoughts." And Christ says "in vain they do worship me teaching for doctrine the commandments of men."

The conscience will always accept or reject according to the teaching a person has received and hence is no guide whatever in deciding questions of this kind; unless it can be proved that the teaching such a person has received is wholly right. But as consciences disagree, all claiming to be right, we know that some must be wrong, unless two persons going in opposite directions may be going the same road, unless two ways may be one way! Peter says baptism "is the answer of a good conscience toward God." 1 Peter

3: 21. Can an ignorant, uninstructed conscience be called a "good conscience?" "For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of God's righteousness have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God." Rom. 10: 2, 3.

DIFFERENT KINDS OF BAPTISMS.

As the word "baptism" biblically means to dip, to plunge, to submerge, to immerse without regard to the element into which the subject is enveloped, it can be easily understood how Christ could baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire, as spoken by John in Matt. 3: 11 and Luke 3: 16. On the day of Pentecost the Holy Ghost "came as a rushing mighty wind, and it filled the whole house where they were sitting." Acts 2: 2. Who can say that they were not baptized (immersed) with the Holy Spirit when it filled the whole house where they were sitting? The baptism with fire is explained in the context: "I (John) indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but there cometh one mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire: whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat (righteous) into his garner; but the chaff (wicked) he will burn with unquenchable fire." Matt. 3: 11, 12. This baptism (immersion) with fire is for the wicked at the end of the world. "The harvest is the end of the world." Matt. 13: 39. "And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." Rev. 20: 15.

Another baptism is spoken of in Mark 10: 38, and Luke 12: 50. Christ says, "But I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how I am straitened (pained) till it be accomplished!" This was spoken more than three years after he had been baptized by John in water;

hence he not only referred to his entombment which Christian baptism symbolizes, but he also referred to his soon immersing into death, which we metaphorically represent in putting "off the old man of sin." "That like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father even so we also should walk in newness of life." Rom. 6: 4.

Baptism, not only brings before us the fact that Christ died, but that he was buried, and rose again. Paul in proving a resurrection of the dead met the non-resurrectionists' argument by saying, "else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why then baptize for the dead?" 1 Cor. 15: 29, i. e. else what shall they do which are immersed into the Christian persecutions, for the dead, or for the sake of death, if death ends all? Why then are they baptized (plunged) into such dangers, if there is no life beyond the tomb? "If in this life 'only' we have hope in Christ we are of all men most miserable." Verse 19. "Why stand we in jeopardy every hour?" Verse 30.

It is assumed by some that when Paul wrote this Corinthian letter, many Christians had conceived superstitious notions in respect to the efficacy of the external rite of baptism, supposing that those catechumens and others who died without baptism, were exposed to certain damnation; and therefore they had adopted a vicarious mode by which they might still receive the benefit of the rite, viz., the relative or friends of such persons (deceased) was baptized in their stead. But judging from the context and general trend of Paul's discourse we favor the former view. We have another baptism mentioned in 1 Cor. 10: 1, 2, where at least two elements were used to envelop; cloud and water. "Our fathers were under the cloud,

and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." This was not a rain cloud; but a cloud especially prepared to shade the Israelites from the scorching sun by day, and became a pillar of fire by night; hence they were not sprinkled, but were hemmed in by walls made from the waters of the sea, and covered by this cloud constituting a complete overwhelming in those two elements, hence they were immersed.

In Heb. 9: 10, the Greek word [*baptismos*] rendered "washings" has the same import as 'baptisms' which could not mean sprinklings, for there were but three sprinklings in the law in which water was an element; one to cleanse a house from a plague, one to cleanse from leprosy, and one to cleanse from ceremonial defilement. Would three be called "divers"? We will now give a few of the "divers washings" where the bodies were "bathed" in water. Lev. 15: 5; 16: 26; Ex. 40: 12; Num. 19: 7, 18; Deut. 23: 11; Lev. 14: 8, 9; 5: 16, 18; 16: 4, 24, 26, 28; 16: 15; 22: 6. At least a dozen purposes necessitated these washings (immersions) under the sacrificial law. All appertaining to the doctrine of Christ as mentioned in Hebrews 6: 1, 2, "Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection, not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God. Of the doctrine of baptisms and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment."

The word "principle" here is derived from the Latin word "*primus*" which means "first." Hence it would read therefore leaving the 'first' of the doctrine of Christ let us go unto perfection, etc. The blood of Abel's sacrifice typified Christ's shed blood, and therefore belonged to the 'first' of the doctrine of Christ. Also

these baptisms (divers washings) as well as the laying on of hands to anoint kings and temporal rulers, and bringing the dead to life, and eternal judgment or God's judgment, or chastening punishments to the nations used as a foundation of repentance and faith toward God, should no longer be embraced as they are now dead works, as is also John's baptism, since the antitype is reached.

THE PURPOSE OF BAPTISM.

"For the priesthood being changed there is made of necessity a change also of the law" (sacrificial law). Heb. 7:12. By direction of this law "the high priests needed daily to offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins, then for the people's." Heb. 7: 27. Nearly all these sacrifices were only types of the real sacrifice which Christ made, consequently when the real sacrifice was made the law authorizing the typical sacrifice reached its limitation. "Which (law) only stood in meats and drinks and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the reformation." Heb. 9: 10.

Now since the purpose of this sacrificial law was to provide atonement for sins (transgressions of the ten commandments) and since this sacrificial law was changed when the priesthood was changed, we are led to enquire what law took its place. The ten commandments still condemns its transgressions, and as the law of condemnation still exists there must be a law of remission; else we must all die in our sins, die under condemnation of that law which condemns (the ten commandments.) But Paul says "The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Rom. 8: 2. Thus we see that the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus is the law of remission or the law which takes the place of the sacrificial law. Heb. 7: 12.

But says one "Did not Christ our high priest make the sacrifice for us?" Yes if we will only accept it. But salvation is not forced upon us against our will. Therefore, there is a definite plan (law) by which we may accept his salvation. If there are no conditions to be met, then all will be saved. These conditions or terms of adoption by which the sinner becomes a child of God, having access to the atoning blood of Christ, is the law by which the sinner gets released from the transgressions of the ten commandment law. Then after being made free from the law, we are then under grace (or favor) of him (Christ who made us free. "What then shall we sin (transgress the law) because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid." Rom. 6: 15. The way then to keep in grace or favor of Christ is to obey the ten commandment law, and if you sin (transgress the law) you have an advocate who will plead your cause. 1 John 2: 1.

Sin today is the transgression of the same law that condemned the transgressing patriarchs, but there has always been a law of atonement to alleviate the sinner from its penalty, through some offering which prefigured, or commemorated some event or thing. Thirty-one different sacrifices were under the sacrificial code of law nearly all of which had expired either by revocation or by limitation, when John the Baptist began his ministry. "The law and the prophets were until John." Luke 16: 16. John seems to have been commissioned to substitute the typical portion of the sacrificial law with his baptism requiring prospective faith in Christ and repentance toward God.

This baptism was immersion in water, "And Jesus when he was baptized (by John) went up straightway out of the water." Matt. 3: 16. Were he not down in the water he could not have come up out of the wa-

ter. This baptism was for the remission of sins. "John did baptize in the wilderness and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Mark 1: 4; Luke 3: 3. But says one, "Christ was baptized unto John's baptism and had no sins to be remitted." Very true; but Christ said he did it "to fulfill all righteousness." Now let me ask was it "only" to fulfill his "own" righteousness? "For he (God) hath made him (Christ) to be sin 'for us' who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." 2 Cor. 5: 21. It was the world's transgression that he sought to remit by setting examples in fulfilling (doing) righteousness.

Christ's injunction to Nicodemus "Except a man be born of the water and the spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God," 1 John 3: 5, certainly embraced water baptism as the water birth. Thus John's baptism like Christ's instituted some three years after was to metaphorically bury the old man (fleshly nature) by a watery burial of the person; then to rise in newness of life or with a new life; hence termed a birth. To thus immerse requires much water, hence the expression, "John was also baptizing in Enon near Salim, because there was 'much' water there." 1 Jno. 3: 23. We are now asked: Did Christ administer John's baptism? Yes, by proxy, i. e., he had his apostles administer the ordinance. "After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea and there he tarried with them and baptized." Jno. 3: 22.

If a man takes the responsibility of doing a piece of work, though his employees do the laboring, yet it can be truthfully said that "he" did it. To justify this view we read Jno. 4: 1. When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John (the Baptist) (though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples). Here is

a plain statement that Christ himself did not baptize, but that his disciples did; "did baptize" being understood. John did not baptize in the name of the son (Jesus) i. e., by the authority of Jesus Christ, but requiring prospective faith; in other words believing the crucifixion yet in the future. "Saying unto the people that they should believe on him (Christ) which should come after him (John) that is on Christ Jesus." Acts 19: 4. If today one should be baptized in this prospective faith, could we say he had received Christian baptism? Certainly not! Truly he would be baptized, but not in the name of Christ or by the authority of Christ.

Apollos was administering such a baptism in the year 55 A. D., calling it John's baptism. Acts 18: 25; 19: 3. And Paul not only rejected such faith, but baptized them again in the name of the Lord Jesus. Verse 5. And thus not only recognizing Christ's authority, but exercising retrospective faith, that is, commemorating the entombment of Christ as a past event. Therefore we see the possibility of being baptized; yet not in Christian baptism. To be baptized in prospective faith is to be baptized by John's baptism. To be baptized while unconverted is to be baptized in mockery. But we are asked how one can be converted before baptism. if baptism is for the remission of sins? Dear reader, there is a vast difference between conversion and remission. Conversion is a turning from one state, manner of life, course of conduct, or principle to another. This takes place in the mind of man. "Except ye be converted and become as little children." Matt. 18: 3. Thus making it obligatory on the part of man and precedes baptism.

Remission is the blotting out of the sin-stained record of the past, which takes place in the mind of Jehovah; and follows baptism. Acts 2: 38; 22: 16. For further

evidence we appeal to Peter's exhortation, "Repent ye therefore, and 'be converted,' that your sins 'may' be blotted out." Acts 3: 19. Therefore, we see that conversion is a duty of man and must precede Christian baptism. I do not maintain that baptism changes the mind, except that it is the obtaining a good conscience before God, and further, that baptism is not valid unless it is preceded by faith and repentance. But says one, "Feelings should be evidence of pardon." I know of no Scripture to justify such a conclusion. Do you base your evidence of pardon on peace, rather than the peace on the proper evidence of pardon?

Faith, repentance, and baptism is the law of pardon, in other words the terms by which a sinner gets released from condemnation, having access to the sacrifice made by Christ. "He that cometh to God 'must believe' that he is." Heb. 11: 6. What shall we do that we may work the work of God? Jesus answered and said unto them, this is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." John 6: 28, 29. "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Acts 2: 38. Thus the three obligations precede remission and as baptism is the last term of the order we understand that the full conditions are met at completion of baptism, hence the expressions "Baptized into Jesus Christ." Rom. 6: 3. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Gal. 3: 27. "Even baptism doth also now save us." 1 Pet. 3: 21. "Why tarriest thou; arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." Acts 22: 16.

But says the catabaptists, "The Gentiles were not baptized for the remission of sins at the household of Cornelius, as were the Jews at the day of Pentecost, and therefore the Gentiles are not required to be bap-

tized." To this position we offer the following objections. There is no proof that they were not baptized for the remission of sins at the household of Cornelius, Acts 10: 48, even though the Holy Ghost was given prior to baptism. The Holy Spirit was not given to them as evidence of pardon, but to convince those Jews which came with Peter, who could not believe that God had granted salvation to the Gentiles and to confirm the revelation given to Peter, that the middle wall, formerly between Jew and Gentile was broken down, and that God would now accept the Gentiles and to confirm "by the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established." After this confirmation Peter said, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we (Jews)" Acts 10: 47. This was an astonishment to the circumcision (Jews) verse 45. Thus Peter had eye-witnesses to justify his action in baptizing those Gentiles. In his defence he said, "What was I that I could withstand God, seeing that he gave them the like gift as he did unto us" (Jews). If the presence of miraculous power will prove remission and sonship then Caiaphas, Balaam, and the beast upon which he rode, were the children of God, for they were in possession of miraculous power. This is probably true also of Judas Iscariot for he was given miraculous power when chosen (see Matt. 10) yet he was a devil from the first. The demonstration of the Holy Ghost at the house of Cornelius was identical with that of the day of Pentecost, and at the day of Pentecost they were commanded to repent and be baptized for remission of sins.

Peter was sent for to tell Cornelius what he must "do that he and his household should be saved". Acts 11: 14; 10: 6, and when he came "he commanded them

to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Acts 10:48. There was also a miraculous demonstration of the Holy Ghost at Paul's conversion; he was struck blind, heard a voice, and his blindness removed before he was baptized. He was certainly converted, but had not yet received remission of sins. "And he trembling, and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do." Acts 9:6. He went into the city and Ananias told him, "Why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Acts 22:16. In Peter's letter to the strangers (Gentiles) 1 Peter 1:1 he says baptism saves us in like figure as the eight souls were saved by water (the flood). Had Noah and his family disobeyed God; would they have been saved by the water?

Noah not only obeyed, but he was immersed (baptized) in the ark "and the Lord shut him in." Gen. 6:16. "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." 1 Peter 3:21. But says one this statement is contradicted by the ("not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God") in the same verse. Let us take this as it reads; sin is not called the filth of the flesh, but filth of the spirit. 2 Cor. 7:1. Peter wished to inform them that the purpose of baptism, was not to clean the body. This would have been a useless expression had they believed baptism to mean sprinkle. For no one would infer that to sprinkle a handful of water on the head would put away the filth of the flesh. Thus baptism is included in the law of pardon to the Gentiles also.

We are now asked why Paul was expressly sent to the Gentiles and said "Christ sent me not to baptize

but to preach the gospel." Paul was exhorting the Corinthian church, not to worship him and Apollos as they were, and because of this he was thankful to God that he baptized no more than he did, lest they should honor him the more. Paul was mighty in speech, but was physically weak. 2 Cor. 12: 7, 8. Therefore he was not commissioned to baptize but to use his strength in the ministry. He preached and organized churches; while another did the baptizing. "I (Paul) have planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase." 1 Cor. 3: 6.

Baptism is one of the three that bear witness of Christ in earth. "And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit and the water, and the blood; and these three agree in one." 1 Jno. 5: 8. The "spirit" as manifested by the character of the individual truly testifies to the ideal life, thus exemplified; the "blood" which the martyrs have shed, and may yet shed will continue to inoculate the ages with that indellible record that Christ died for them. The "water" which envelopes the repentant believer truly bears witness to the entombment of Christ. Now as Christ was submerged in the tomb but "once" therefore the candidate for baptism should be submerged but once beneath the water to symbolize Christ's burial and resurrection, hence those who dip the subject three times, as some think it necessary to do, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Each separately (though "these three are one") 1 Jno. 5:7) destroy the symbol, and therefore are guilty of perverting the gospel. Three dips are three baptisms; and Paul says "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." Eph. 4: 5. Now let me say to the Pede-baptists your infant baptism is mockery.

Baptism must be preceded by faith. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth"

not shall be damned." Mark 16: 16. "The eunuch said see here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? and Philip said if thou 'believest' with all thine heart thou mayest." Acts 8: 36, 37. Can infants believe?

Repentance is also a prerequisite to baptism, "repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins". Acts 2: 38. Can infants repent? Infants have no sins to be remitted, nor to repent of. Sin is the transgression of the law (ten commandments) 1 Jno. 3: 4. The effect of sin (mortality) is transmitted from parents to children; lust also, in a degree, is hereditary, but sin itself is not transmitted; "lust when it hath conceived bringeth forth sin." But in infancy hereditary lusts hath not conceived; therefore is not sin. Infants are pure in the sight of God, else Christ would not have blessed them and said "of such is the kingdom of heaven." "Except ye be converted and become as little children ye cannot enter the kingdom," etc. Did he mean to say you must become better than little children?

Now, dear reader, if sin is transmitted from parent to child then Christ would have been sinful; because he was born of Mary and the Bible abundantly prove's that Christ was perfect and knew no sin. Now in conclusion I wish to emphasize two points: (1) that Philip administered Christian baptism to the eunuch "and they went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him." Acts 8: 38. (2) That baptism is one of the three commands in the law of pardon, and therefore for the remission of sins Acts 2: 38; 22: 16; 1 Peter 3: 21; Rom. 8: 2. But says one the preposition "for" means "because of." But note they were commanded to repent for the same thing that they were to be baptized for. Should we repent because our sins are removed?