

21.15.2001  
X  
Per  
P928A  
v.15

# THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

NO. 55=JANUARY, 1901.

## I. THREE MALIGNED THEOLOGIANS.

Dr. John A. Broadus was fond of telling how his father proved, from the Bible, "there is no God." Calling his son to him and placing his finger over the first line of the 14th Psalm it read, "there is no God." The boy was satisfied, the Bible said it, and that ended it. When his father removed his finger it read, "The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God." It has occurred to us that this is not an unfair illustration of the manner of proof offered in the discussion now pending regarding infant salvation. We wish to set this forth particularly in reference to John Calvin, Dr. William Twisse and Jonathan Edwards.

Calvin formulated and left to the world a system of theology; the sweep of this subject should have corrected what was believed by many, owing to the bearing of certain great doctrines of the Bible on infant salvation, independent of their relation to theology as a whole.

We propose to show from Calvin's writings that he states in language as unmistakable as "there is no God," that infants are condemned, and to prove from the context that the declaration is as foreign and untrue to his mind regarding those dying in infancy, as the above declaration is to the mind and context of the Bible.

These men wrote in times of controversy and much of their writing is controversial and the figure of hypothesis is frequently used. In proving the justice of God's decrees, hypothetical sentences are used too severe not to be rep-

#### IV. BAPTISM.

In I Cor. 12:13 we read, "For also with one Spirit were we all baptized into one body." Every one agrees that here the translation should be *into* rather than *unto*, and that here *baptize* signifies a putting into. It is true that that into which this baptism introduces is not water, but that it does introduce into something is undeniable. Calling this idea of putting into *intuspositio*n, we may lay down the formula, Baptism signifies intusposition. It is equally plain that there is here no taking out after the putting in, but the persons thus put into one body were put in to stay. *Baptism, therefore, signifies permanent intusposition.* Further, that into which baptism puts to stay is expressed in Greek by the object of the proposition, *eis*.

Bearing in mind that this baptism puts into one body of Christ and his people, therein to remain, we are not surprised to read in Gal. 3:27, "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ, put Christ on." Here baptism means permanent intusposition into Christ, not into water.

If, now, we read in Rom. 6:3, "Or do ye fail to know that as many of us as were baptized into Christ Jesus, were baptized into his death?" we again see baptism putting men into Christ Jesus instead of into water, and putting them into Him to stay instead of dipping them. It is permanent intusposition into Jesus Christ.

The same Greek words in the same construction must bear the same meaning in I Cor. 10:2, "For they were all baptized into Moses with the cloud and with the sea." It was a baptism that symbolized permanent union with Moses, just as the baptism of Gal. 3:27 effected permanent union with Christ. Here, too, it is *baptize into* instead of *unto*, but it is not baptize into water.

If we turn back in this Epistle to 1:13-15, we shall see that, as by the name of Paul he could not have meant much different from Paul, so '*eis* the name of Paul' can hardly mean either *unto* or *in* the name of Paul, while '*eis* Moses'

means *into* Moses. "Hath Christ been divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were ye baptized into the name of Paul? I give thanks to God that I baptized none of you except Crispus and Gaius, lest some one should say that ye were baptized into my name." "Into the name of Paul" stands in contrast with "into the name of the Lord Jesus." Compare Acts 8:16, where it says of the Samaritan converts, that "they had been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus." This cannot mean "in the name," which is expressed by "en" the name, not by "eis." If any of Paul's converts were baptized by his command, it would have been easy to say that they were baptiz<sup>d</sup> *in his name*, that is by his authority, but *into the name* has a much deeper meaning. Baptism into one's name must mean no less than permanent intusposition into *him as revealed*. Such baptism puts into indissoluble union with. Paul did not take the place of Christ, not even in the sense in which Moses was a type of Christ. For the Israelites were baptized into Moses typically, as the true Israelites are baptized into Christ really; but in no sense will Paul admit that the Corinthian saints were baptized into his own name. Again it is to be noted, that here is permanent intusposition into a person, and not dipping in water.

With this light we come to Mat. 28:19. Shall we render "Baptizing into the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit," or shall we depart from this plain consistency by rendering "Baptizing in the name?" The arguments against *in* are as follows: First, it gives to *eis* a strange meaning, and to *baptize in eis* is a meaning that it will not bear elsewhere. Secondly, it imposes upon this Greek a meaning so difficult when no other Greek would express *into* and when *en* would have immediately expressed *in*. And third, the erroneous rendering *in* proceeds upon the erroneous assumption that here is a formula prescribed for use in the ceremony of baptism, whereas there is no evidence that this form of words was so used until after the age of the Apostles. But our Lord really meant such thorough indoctrination in the revealed truth of the Trinity

as can be properly called a baptism into the Three as revealed. He means something more than a ceremony; he means a teaching, a teaching so thorough as to transpose all the nations into a new world of thought and belief, a putting of them permanently into the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. It is well to use these words in the ceremony, since they help to direct attention constantly to the great organic principle of the Christian system, the Trinity; but we should never forget that the mission of the Church is not to administer ceremonies, but to baptize into truth.

Let us now return to Rom. 6:3, 4: "Or do ye fail to know that as many of us as were baptised into Christ Jesus, were baptised into his death? Therefore by the baptism into death we were buried with him." This baptism into Christ was identical with the baptism into Christ of Gal. 3:27. This baptism into Christ was baptism into his death, not into water. The death of Christ was his severance or release from sin; and as many as are baptised into Christ are permanently united with him in his severance or release from sin. We are transposed into a new world of freedom. But the baptism is permanent intusposition into this death, this divorce from sin, and not dipping in water.

It was the Paul who wrote 1 Cor. 12:13; Gal. 3:27, and Rom. 6:3, 4, not to mention 1 Cor. 1:13, 15, and 10:2, that also asked the twelve disciples at Ephesus, "Into what, then, were ye baptised?" and got from them the answer, "Into John's baptism." See Acts 19:3. "John's baptism" meant a certain body of doctrine (compare 18:25); and to be baptised into that doctrine meant to be initiated into it fully and permanently. "Unto," if we think upon it, would be meaningless here.

Let us now come to Acts 2:38: "Change your mind, and let each of you be, in [or upon] the name of Jesus Christ, baptized into forgiveness of your sins, and ye will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

If we read "in (*en*) the name of Jesus Christ," we must interpret 'by his authority'; but if we read "upon (*epi*) the name," we must interpret by 'resting upon him as revealed.'

There is no evidence for reading "into (*eis*) the name" here. But we do and certainly should read "*eis* forgiveness" Shall we translate it *unto*, which would be meaningless here, or *for*, which changes the consistent meaning of the Greek to make a proof-text for the error of baptismal justification, or consistently *into*? Let us remember that, if Peter wished to say *into*, he had to use *eis*; but, if he wished to say *for* or *unto*, he had at his service Greek that would have unmistakably meant *for* or *unto*. To be baptized into forgiveness means to be fully and permanently brought into this truth.

Accordingly Mk. 1:4 and Lk. 3:3 should not be translated "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins," but "change-of mind baptism into the remission of sins." It was a baptism professing change of mind, and is rightly called a baptism professing change of mind, or a change-of-mind baptism. And it was a baptism into remission. It was the symbol of introduction into forgiveness. Here again is a putting in to stay, not a dipping; and it is a putting into a truth, not into water.

Similar is Mat. 3:11, "I baptize you with water into repentance." This baptism with water is a symbol of baptism into repentance, that is permanent intusposition into this truth. Not a dipping, but a putting into to stay; not a putting into water, but into truth.

Nor is Mk. 1:9 an instance of baptism into water, since *eis* belongs, not to the verb *baptize*, but to the preceding verb of motion—a frequent construction in Greek. The feeling of the original would be expressed by the following: "Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee unto the Jordan, and was baptized therein" (or thereat).

This rapid review of every passage in which *baptizein eis* or *baptisma eis* occurs in the New Testament discovers, that baptize or baptism, in all these cases means putting into to stay, and never dipping, always permanent intusposition, and never temporary intusposition. It is a matter of course that New Testament baptism is never said to be *eis* water (into water), which would necessarily involve drowning. *The New Testament knows nothing of baptism into water.*



Nor does it know anything of baptism into that of which water is the symbol. Water is the symbol of Spirit; but there is no baptism into Spirit, in the New Testament. The New Testament speaks of baptism into one body; of baptism into persons, as Christ, Christ Jesus, Moses; of baptism into the name of Paul, of the Lord Jesus, of the Father and Son and of the Holy Spirit; and of baptism into truths, as death to sin, John's baptism, the forgiveness of sins, and change of mind; but never of baptism into Spirit or baptism into water.

On the other hand, it is always baptism WITH water or Spirit. Matt. 3:11, "I indeed baptize you with water into repentance; but He that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear—He will baptize you with Holy Spirit and fire." Here *with* is expressed according to the Hellenic idiom, by *en* and the Dative. Mk. 1:8, "I baptize you with water, but He will baptize you with Holy Spirit." Here *with* is expressed by the *en* (in connection with water, if not Spirit), which makes *with* unmistakably the meaning. Luke 3:16, "I indeed baptize you with water (the Dative without *en*) . . . . He will baptize you with Holy Spirit and fire." Jno. 1:26, "I baptize with water." V. 31, "I came baptizing with water." And v. 33, "He that sent me to baptize with water, he said to me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and abiding upon him, this is he that is baptized with Holy Spirit." Acts 1:5, "John indeed baptized with water [Dative without *en*], but ye shall be baptized with Holy Spirit not many days hence." 1 Cor. 10:2, "And were all baptized into Moses with the cloud and with the sea." Eph. 12:13, "For also with one Spirit we were all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink one Spirit." Real baptism is always baptism with Spirit, and ceremonial baptism is always baptism with water. Real baptism is permanent in-tusposition into Christ, or the one body of which he is the head, into the name of the Trinity, or into forgiveness of sins or death to sin; and ceremonial baptism is always a

symbol of this real baptism. In real baptism the Spirit is sent upon the person baptized and brings him into Christ; in symbolic baptism the water should be put upon the person. The fundamental truth of Calvinism, that the Holy Spirit and not the sinner initiates and effects the sinner's union with Christ, forbids a symbol in which the sinner comes as able to move to water as to what lies dead; it requires rather that water as vivifying come upon the sinner as dead. The correlative truth, once in Christ forever in him, will not allow the symbol of baptism into him to be a putting in and taking out. Dipping in water, if done for the sake of putting into water and taking out again, is contrary to the New Testament. Baptism into water is an invention of men; baptism into Christ is the teaching of God.

Only he fully knows the truth who knows how others miss it. How is it that so many men of piety and learning believe that only dipping in water is the true symbolic baptism? Is it not due to the fact that baptism does have in it the idea of putting into? Shall we in protesting against dipping deny this? Not thus shall we ever convince them; for thus we show ourselves in error. Their mistake lies in making the intusposition of baptism intusposition into water instead of into Christ.

The truth reconciles. The errors which are fragments of truth come into harmony in a whole truth. That baptism signifies a putting into, and that baptism signifies a modelless influencing, stand harmonious, into one body with one Spirit.

And any truth is harmonious with all truth. Man's utter dependence on the Divine Spirit; the performance of union with Christ; the Trinitarian system, these are some of the doctrines which stand in manifest harmony with baptism with Spirit into Christ.

But it would not be just to the relative importance of points and principles, if this brief paper stopped without insisting on the importance of that special truth which receives its emphatic assertion in baptism, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, The Sabbath, commemorating God's creation

of all things out of nothing and his raising of Jesus Christ from the dead, is a reiterative witness for the honor of God the Father. The Lord's supper commemorating the death of Jesus Christ, by which he made propitiation for sins and became himself receivable as life and sustenance, is a dumb but eloquent witness for the honor of God the Son. And Baptism, the third of the three observances of the Christian religion, commemorating the outpouring of the Holy Spirit as the Giver and Director of life and power, is the beautiful and persuasive witness for the honor of God the Holy Spirit. Immeasurably more important than correctness in the ceremony is appreciation of the Spirit. And we must let no aberrations of some who study the doctrine of the Holy Spirit frighten us from the investigation. Some fail where many succeed. The importance of the subject will excuse our search ; and the wealth to be gained will reward us. The truth of baptism gives to the Holy Spirit his place ; the Holy Spirit must have his place in any symmetrical doctrine of the Trinity ; and the symmetry of the Trinity is the beauty and the proof of the Christian system.

Oxford, Ala.

F. P. RAMSAY.