

THE
Canadian Independent.

VOL. XXIII.

TORONTO, APRIL, 1877.

No. 10.

MISQUOTED TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE ; No. VI.

“Buried with Him by baptism,” &c. Rom. vi., 4.

By THE EDITOR.

Nobody needs to be told that this is *par eminentie*, the proof text of Immersionists. It is produced on all occasions as irrefragable, incontrovertible, unassailable. Any one who attempts to prove that it may be understood any other way than as referring to baptism by immersion, by the very act, in the judgment of many of them, writes himself down—well, we won't say what! Multitudes who can quote no other verse in Romans, can quote this. It is wrought into every sermon on immersion, and we might almost say, travestied in every hymn. In fact, we do not know what our Baptist friends would do, if any one should ever succeed in convincing them that Paul didn't mean what they have heretofore understood by it. Why, it would knock the bottom out of every baptistery, and take away the “cross” they sing so much about bearing, and spoil all their nice poetry about “sinking beneath the bending wave,” and being “where Jesus was,” and land them high and dry on the shores of Pædobaptism, to struggle back into the water the best way they would. However, such an event is yet in the future; and, as a friend of ours suggests, we need *wet* Congregationalists, as well as *dry* ones; and therefore we will not further harrow up any body's feelings by anticipating what the consequence of such a change will be, when that enlightened day comes.

Having given some little attention to this subject, however, and having arrived at a totally different understanding of the passage from our Baptist brethren, we will proceed to give our reasons for classing this among misquoted and misapplied texts.

And at the very outset, we desire to say, that this is not a question to be decided by an array of great names on the one side or on the other. If the reasons we are about to assign for the view we hold of the passage are good and valid, and Wesley and Whitfield, and Chalmers, held the opposite view, (though they were Pædobaptists in practice) they are as good and valid against Wesley, and the rest, as against the humblest man that ever held them. If, on the other hand, they are illogical and insufficient, and can be shown to be so, then no great names on our side of the discussion, can ever make them anything else.

Having thus premised, let us try to forget the controversy, and look at the passage in its connection. What is the Apostle writing about? He is meeting an objection which he supposes some one may urge to the doctrine of justification by faith, and which has, in fact, often been urged,—“Why, if sin can be so