

Contributions.

The Commission vs. Denominationalism.

XII.

T. B. KNOWLES.

The following undeniable facts have been adduced, all of which fully sustain the genuineness of immersion and the spuriousness of affusion:

(1) It is a fact, that the Catholic church has always affirmed, that the baptism given by Jesus Christ was immersion and not sprinkling or pouring.

(2) The Catholic church frankly admits that she has altered the primitive action of baptism from immersion to sprinkling and pouring, and also charges Protestant churches with having done the same.

(3) The Catholic church has never attempted to justify the practice of affusion by an appeal to the Scriptures, but simply rests upon the right and authority of the Church to change ordinances.

(4) The first law for sprinkling and pouring was given by the Pope of Rome, and that about 753 A. D.

(5) The testimony of some of the most scholarly men in the *pedo-baptist* ranks, is, in proof of immersion, that this was the New Testament baptism, and that sprinkling was introduced at a much later date, and is therefore a purely human invention.

(6) That the testimony of the scholarship of both the Catholic and Protestant churches is that the primary meaning of *baptizo* is "to immerse, to dip, to plunge."

(7) It is a fact that there is no controversy over the genuineness of immersion, this being accepted by all as Christian baptism.

(8) That the whole controversy is over sprinkling and pouring, and that these were rejected at the first "as no baptism at all," and are so rejected yet by a large portion of the Christian world. But the evidence is not all in yet. There are other important facts to be considered, in proof of immersion as the only baptism authorized by Jesus Christ in the commission and practiced by the primitive church.

(9) A ninth fact is that the lexicons of the Greek language written by *pedo-baptist* scholars are almost unanimous in giving immersion as the primitive meaning of *baptizo*. Bishop Keane, president of the Catholic University, Washington, D. C., says that "the best dictionaries show the classical meaning of the Greek word *baptizein* is primarily to plunge, to dip;" and the eminent scholar, Moses Stuart (Congregationalist) says, "*bapto* and *baptizo* mean to dip, to plunge, to immerse, into anything liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this;" and Prof. Humphreys, M. A., of Vanderbilt University (Methodist) says, "There is no standard Greek-English lexicon that gives sprinkle or pour as a meaning of *baptizo*." It will be in order, then, to cite a few of these, the most learned and most competent witnesses in this case in the world. LIDDELL and SCOTT, 7th edition: "*Baptizo*, to dip in or under water." E. A. SOPHOCLES, a Greek, and professor of Greek 38 years in Harvard: "*Baptizo*, to dip, to immerse, to sink." He adds, "There is no evidence that Luke and Paul and the other writers of the New Testament put upon this verb meanings not recognized by the Greeks." Dr. W. POPPE gives "To dip in, to dip under." J. W. FRADENSDORF defines *baptizein* and *baptism* "To baptize, to dip." BULLINGER: "*Baptizo*, to make a thing dipped or dyed, to immerse for a religious purpose. By baptism therefore we must understand an

immersion." A. H. STEPHENS: "*baptizo*, to merge, to immerse, also to dip." BLASS: "*baptizo*, to immerse or plunge in water." SUICER: "*baptizo*, to immerse, to dip." STAKINS: "*baptizo*, by the force of the word indicates the idea of dipping or immersion; properly speaking it is a dipping or immersion in water." SCHLUSNER: "*baptizo*, properly to immerse, to dip, to immerse in water." GROVES: "*baptizo*, to dip, to immerse, to immerge, to plunge." And Greenfield, who says, "I wish it to be distinctly understood that I am neither a Baptist nor the son of a Baptist, nor is it my business to make a defense of their cause," defines *baptizo* to immerse, to immerge, to submerge, to sink." The following are Greek and English lexicons of the New Testament: PROF. J. H. THAYER: "*Baptizo*, to dip repeatedly, to immerse, to submerge, . . . an immersion in water." And on *baptisma* he says, "A word peculiar to the New Testament and ecclesiastical writers, immersion, submersion." CREMER: *Baptizo*, to immerse, to submerge, The peculiar New Testament and Christian use of the word to denote immersion, submersion for a religious purpose—baptize." DR. EDWARD ROBINSON: "*Baptizo*, to dip, to sink, to immerse." PROF. GRIMM: "*Baptisma*, a word peculiar to the N. T. and the church. *Immersion*, *submersion*. The holy submersion commanded by Christ." The statement of one whose learning and candor entitle him to the confidence of men, is so apposite here, I give his words in full. Alexander Campbell says: "We have then the unanimous testimony of all the distinguished lexicographers known in Europe and America, that the word chosen by Jesus Christ in his commission to the apostles, is to dip, plunge, immerse; and that any other meaning is tropical, rhetorical or fanciful" (C. Rep. pg. 126).

(10) It is also a fact that *pedo-baptist* critics and commentators in their annotations upon the Scriptures sustain the proposition that immersion is the primary meaning of *baptizo*, and the only practice of the primitive church. Thus GROTIUS says, "That this rite was wont to be performed by immersion, and not by perfusion, appears both by the propriety of the word and the places chosen for its administration (John iii. 24, Acts viii. 38), and by the many allusions of the apostles, which cannot be referred to sprinkling, Rom. vi. 3, 4, Col. ii. 12." BLOOMFIELD says on Rom. vi. 4: "There is here plainly a reference to the ancient mode of baptism by immersion. . . . There is reason to regret it should have been abandoned in most Christian churches." SCHOLZ says on Matt. iii. 6: "Baptism consists in the immersion of the whole body in water." ZWINGLE, on Rom. vi. 3: "Into His death, when ye were immersed into the water of baptism, ye were ingrafted into the death of Christ, that is, the immersion of your whole body in water was a sign," etc. DR. GEO. CAMPBELL, in his notes on Matt. iii. 11, says: "The word *baptizo*, both in sacred authors and in classical, signifies to dip, to plunge, to immerse, and was rendered by Tertullian, the oldest of the Latin fathers, *tingere*, the term used for dyeing cloth, which was by immersion. . . . Accordingly the baptized are said . . . to arise or ascend, v. 16, and Acts viii. 39, from or out of the water." PROF. J. A. TURRETIN (Geneva) says on Rom. vi. 3, 4: "And indeed baptism was performed in that age, in those countries, by immersion of the whole body into water." MEYER, on Mark vii. 4 says: "Moreover, *can me baptizontai* is not to be understood of washing the hands, . . . but of immersion, which the word in classic Greek, and in the New Testament, everywhere means." FRITZ-

SCHIFF, on Matt. says: "But that in accordance with the notion of the word *baptizesthai*, baptism was then performed not by sprinkling upon, but by submerging, is proved especially by Rom. vi. 4." And PROF. T. C. STORR says: "When the Lord commanded that disciples should be *baptized* (Matt. xxviii. 19) the apostles, through those things which had gone before, could have understood nothing else than that men should be immersed in water; nor did they, in truth, understand anything else but immersion, as is evident from the testimony of the sacred writings and from the usage of the ancient church, by which immersion had been so received." JOHN CALVIN, on John iii. says: "From these words it is lawful to conclude that baptism was celebrated by John and Christ, by the submersion of the whole body." Again, "here we see plainly what the rite of baptism among the ancients was, for they immersed the whole body into water" (Com. on Acts viii. 38). "Although it is certain, both that the word itself of baptizing signifies to immerse, and the rite of immersing was observed by the ancient church" (Institutes). LUTHER says: "And so baptism signifies two things—death and resurrection. . . . For in that the minister immerses the child into water, signifying death, but in that he brings it out again, signifying life. For so Paul sets forth, Rom. vi. For we are buried with Christ by baptism into death." WESLEY, Rom. vi. 3: "We are buried with him, alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion." ADAM CLARK, on Col. ii. 12: "*Buried with him in baptism*. Alluding to the immersion practiced in the case of adults, wherein the person appeared to be buried under the water, as Christ was buried in the heart of the earth. His rising again on the third day, and their emerging from the water was an emblem of the resurrection of the body, and, to them, of a total change of life." And on Rom. vi. 4: "It is probable that the apostle here alludes to the mode of administering baptism by immersion, the whole body being put under the water, which seemed to say, the man is drowned, is dead; and when he came up out of the water, he seemed to have a resurrection to life: *the man is risen again, he is alive!*" SAMUEL CLARK: "*We are buried with Christ in baptism*, etc. In the primitive times, the manner of baptizing was by immersion, or dipping the whole body into the water," etc. DONDRIDGE, on Acts iii. 23: "For though thou wast solately washed with the water of baptism, etc.;" and on viii. 38, "Considering how frequently bathing was used in those hot countries, it is not to be wondered that baptism was generally administered by immersion. . . . It would be very unnatural to suppose that they went down to the water, merely that Philip might take up a little water in his hand to pour on the cunuch," etc. On Rom. vi. 4 he says: "It seems the part of candor to confess that here is an allusion to the manner of baptizing by immersion, as most usual in these early times," etc. BARNES, on Rom. vi. 4: "It is altogether probable that the apostle in this place had allusion to the custom of baptizing by immersion." CONEYBEARE and HOWSON, Rom. vi. 4: "This passage cannot be understood unless it is borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion." BISHOP LIGHTFOOT says in Col. ii. 12: "Ye were buried with Christ to your old selves beneath the baptismal waters, and were raised with him from the same waters, to a new and better life" (Expositio's Bible, Col., pg. 206). WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES, on Rom. vi. 4: "Buried with Him in baptism. In this phrase the apostle seemeth to allude to the ancient manner of baptizing, which was to dip the

parties baptized, and, as it were, bury them under water." WHITBY: "It being so expressly declared here, Rom. vi. 4, and Col. ii. 12, that we are buried with Christ in baptism by being buried under water, and the argument to oblige us to a conformity to his death, by dying to sin, being taken hence; and this immersion being religiously observed by all Christians for thirteen centuries," etc. GEORGE WHITFIELD: "It is certain that in the words of our text, Rom. vi. 3, 4, there is an allusion to the manner of baptism, which was by immersion, which is what our church allows." MACKNIGHT, on Rom. vi. 4: "Christ . . . submitted to be baptized, that is, to be buried under the water by John, and to be raised out of it again, as an emblem of His future death and resurrection. In like manner, the baptism of believers is emblematical of their own death, burial, and resurrection (see Col. ii. 12)." Rom. vi. 5 "Having been planted," etc. "The burying of Christ and of believers, first in the water of baptism, and afterwards in the earth, is fitly enough compared to the planting of seeds in the earth," etc., and on Col. ii. 12 he says: "Christ began His ministry with receiving baptism from John, to show in an emblematical manner that He was to die, and to rise again from the dead. And after His resurrection He commanded His disciples to initiate mankind into His religion by baptizing them, as He Himself had been baptized. . . . To conclude, because this spiritual circumcision is to be completed by Christ raising our bodies fashioned like to His glorious body, signified in baptism by the raising of the body out of the water," etc. LANGR: "The phrase *baptizein eis* retains the most direct figurative reference of baptism. It means strictly to immerse into Christ" (Com. on Rom. vi. 3). These scholarly men, and many more, that might be quoted, bear strong testimony to the truth, and condemn the practice of their own churches thereby.

Jewish Sabbath and Christians' Lord's Day.

A "type" signifies a shadow or outline picture of something relating to the outline.

The word "antitype" denotes the substance or the reality which is prefigured by the type.

When God called Abraham out of Ur of Chaldea, he made a covenant or promise to him. (Gen. xii. 1-3.) These promises were afterwards repeated; the promise of nationality which it contained, was made the basis of the covenant or law as given on Sinai to the children of Israel, under their leader, Moses. This law was given to the Jews for the purposes of a civil government, and, as such, was well adapted to their development, discipline and happiness, as individuals and as a nation. (1 Tim. i. 8-9.) These laws were needed to convince and convict men of sin, by presenting a standard of perfection, and also for the preservation among them of the knowledge and practice of a true and pure religion during the Mosaic Dispensation, which was but the type of the Remedial System, by means of symbols, rites and ceremonies or services.

From the very beginning of our race we find that one day of the seven was sanctified by its Creator, and in the Decalogue or law of Mount Sinai the same observance was enjoined by God upon His creatures. (Gen. ii. 1, 2, 3; Ex. xx. 8-11.)

Thus a rest day or Sabbath was given to the Jews; on that day they assembled that they might not forget the law, and it was only when the synagogue was established, and in every community the law read and ex-

pounded, and God was worshipped in the public assembly that the Sabbath was steadily and safely kept.

The day of rest has never been abrogated; the laws which were made solely for the Jewish race might be abrogated at a fitting time, but the day of rest was made, not for the Jew alone, but for man. It was made at man's creation; we do not owe it to the Jew, we received it from God; it was thundered indeed from Sinai to the Jew, but it was whispered to us in Paradise when the heavens and earth were created, and God blessed the day.

While it on the one hand formed a sort of general memorial of the creation, and the Creator of all things, as it is characterized in the first redaction of the commandments, it became also a national day of a record of the bondage and liberation from it, as in the second rescension of the Decalogue; and the rest, intended for everyone, became doubly significant. (Deut. v. 15.)

To summarize. The Jewish Sabbath was to be spent in resting. (Ex. xxxi. 14-17.) It was to be a covenant between God and His people. (Ezek. xx. 12.) It was to be spent in keeping the ordinances and as a day of joy and delight, noiv to the Lord. (Ezek. xlv. 17, and Isaiah lviii. 13, 14.)

The benefits of this institution for the individual are too self-evident to require comment. It connected the human being with the Divine Creator, and with his fellow-creatures and testified good will to all things created.

The providences of God follow closely upon natural laws; we cannot violate the law of physical rest without suffering serious consequences; the necessity and obligation to rest is inherent to man's very nature. Rest does not consist in utter inaction, but is rather a change of occupation. A rest day is to better life a necessity; as the body demands rest, so the soul and spirit will be dwarfed and stunted unless they receive a calm from the absorbing cares and endless exactions of this active age. Disobedience was the cause of all the afflictions of Israel, and the observance of this law was insisted upon by the voice of the prophets, and declared to be decisive of national prosperity or decline; for religion was never on the throne while Sabbaths were trodden under foot. (Ezek. xx. 19, 20.)

Thus in the whole of the divine economy the day has great importance; it was declared by the Lord Jesus, who alone kept the whole law, to be made for man. (Mark ii. 27.)

When Jesus addressed the Jews, he nowhere enjoined the observance of the Sabbath, as His hearers were almost superstitiously scrupulous in keeping it. What His hearers needed and received was the lesson that the Sabbath, having been intended for human benefit, the duty of observing it ought to give way before the higher duty of effecting that purpose, where the two were in conflict.

If the Sabbath or seventh day had large meaning and sacredness to the Jews, far more has the first day of the week to the Christians. We do not keep the seventh day, but look upon it as a type of the holy day of which the day of Christ's resurrection is the antitype, believing that

"Twas great to speak a world from naught,

"Twas greater to redeem."

The antitype, or first day, rose into sacredness by the innate power and peculiar grandeur of the facts it celebrated. The old law was nailed to the cross and taken out of the way, and with it went all types and ceremonies. (Col. ii. 14, 15, 16, 17; Rom. vii. 4; Heb. viii. 6, 7, 8-12 and Heb. ix., 1-14, 15.)