

Abilene Christian University

Digital Commons @ ACU

Stone-Campbell Books

Stone-Campbell Resources

1923

Methodist Dynamite Exploded, Third Edition

Joe S. Warlick

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), and the [Christianity Commons](#)

Methodist Dynamite Exploded

By _____
JOE S. WARLICK



THIRD EDITION
Enlarged and Revised

Price 35 Cents

DALLAS, TEXAS
1923

METHODIST
DYNAMITE
EXPLODED

JOE S. WARLICK

THIRD EDITION
Enlarged and Revised



Price 35 Cents



DALLAS, TEXAS
1923

NO. B. McCRAW, The Printer



JOE S. WARLICK

Standing on same spot where he stood while preaching his first sermon. Picture made 32 years thereafter.

INTRODUCTION.

Mr. C. L. Ballard, the man whose book the following pages review is dead. This will explain why I do not put his picture on the cover of this edition. I respected Mr. Ballard when he lived, and I shall respect him enough now not to use his picture as I did on the other two editions of the book.

I know of much good the book has done, and trust with this corrected edition, more carefully proof read, and with added matter much other good will come to the cause of truth by reading it.

It will be remembered that Mr. Ballard published a book containing a dialogue between an Immersionist and an Affusionist, he writing both sides. I took his part, that is the Sprinklers side and reproduced it just as he had it, and wrote the Immersionists side of the dialogue myself. The following is what I have done in the third edition. Read it and I think you will be benefitted.

JOE S. WARLICK.

Methodist Dynamite Exploded

CHAPTER I.

The meaning of the words Baptize and Baptizo.

Ballard. If we affusionists would instruct the youth of our land and have good strong Methodist members, we must continue to repeat our views of these doctrines to our people. And we do not hesitate to say the parent, the preacher, or the church that neglects to instruct those under their care along these doctrinal lines will have a weak, indistinct union sentiment among their children and members. But here stands an immersion brother now, laughing at me about that union sentiment **opinion**. He has his hand raised as if he wanted to ask me a **question**, so, what is it, brother?

Warlick. Well, yes; I should like to know if you do not believe you ought to try to make Christians and not Methodists? Do you not believe that a union in the church of God, the one church or body of Christ, would be a good thing? You know Paul says in Eph. 4:4, "There is one body"—and in chapter 1 and verses 22 and 23, you remember he says, "That one body is the church." So there should be but one, and that one Christ's church, and not Methodist church, Presbyterian, or any other human concern, not known in the Bible. Do you not believe we should have that kind of union?

B. Yes; of course I do. More than any immersionist in this country. Now let us see. I believe that we all belong to one and the same church, and that we all believe in the **same things; do you?**

W. No, I know we do all not believe the same things, neither do we belong to the same church, and I know that you know it, too. Also that we shall never belong to the same church until you, and those like you, leave your human institutions called churches, and come into the church you read about in the Bible. There are as many churches in this country as there are names, and creeds; and the one you belong to is one of the many, that we could very easily do without. God knows nothing of it, neither should we. **You had better leave the thing and come to the truth.**

B. Yes, I see you want us to do all the uniting, and you dictate the terms; that's the way, is it? Well, we are not coming,

but I still hold we believe in the same things. Now let us take the belief of every true child of God.

1. We all believe in Christ as the **Redeemer**.
2. We all believe in **Repentance**.
3. We all believe in **Justification**.
4. We all believe in **Regeneration**.
5. We all believe in being **Baptized**.
6. We all believe in taking the **Supper**.
7. We all believe in the **Resurrection**.
8. And we all believe in future **rewards and punishment**, don't

we?

W. No, we do not agree in the things you here enumerate. Neither do you agree with God's word in those things. The definition of God as given in your discipline, is not the God of the Bible, and the Jesus Christ of the New Testament, is not the character of person whom you present to the world as their Savior. The repentance you preach is not gospel repentance; you even have it out of its proper position. You teach, that it must precede faith in gospel order, while the scriptures teach, that you cannot please God without faith. See Heb. 11-6. Peter commanded persons to believe (**know assuredly**) and afterward he commanded them to repent. See Acts 2:36:38. You teach, that men are justified by faith only. See Discipline article 9. While James says, that a man 'is justified by **works, and not by faith only.**' Jas. 2-18:24. What you do in observing what you call the 'Sacrament,' a term, by the way, you learned from your grandmother, the Catholic church, is not the Lord's supper. **That should be taken every first day of the week.** See Acts 20-7; 1 Cor. 16-1. So you miss it on the frequency of its observance. Neither do you have the scriptural purpose of the institution. The truth is, I very much doubt your being correct in any thing that is peculiarly a characteristic of your faith and practice. Do you not think you should get right in a few things at least, before you begin to talk about union with those who do believe and teach the truth?"

B. Well, brother, remember we are agreed on baptism. That is, we all believe in the act; but differ in how it is done. In the **what**, we are one. In the **how**, we are many. Now, do you think you ought to get mad at me, or your neighbor, because we do not plow as you do, and say we are not farmers, and are not plowing, just because we do not plow as you do?

W. But the word baptize itself includes the how of doing it. The how, is in fact, the definition of the word. When you baptize, you baptize; you do not sprinkle and pour. When you

sprinkle and pour, you do not baptize at all. If I were to hire you to plow a hundred-acre field, and you were to take a broom-straw and make a few scratches in one corner, and then claim that you had plowed the field, and that I ought to accept the work and say nothing about how you plowed it, I would know that you did not know how to plow, any more than you seem to know how to baptize. So what do you think your nonsensical illustration does for you anyway?

B. Well, nothing; only I want you immersionists to get a picture of yourselves, condemning and consigning every one who dares to differ from you, to be lost, or excommunicating them from the church.

W. I do not exclude you from the church of Christ. This I could not do, unless you were a member of it; but you are not, and have never been. If any of your people are ever saved therefore, it will not be because you are in the kingdom; it will be through the uncovenanted mercies of God's grace given for the salvation of those who are honestly ignorant of the truth. But you, Mr. Ballard, and others like you, cannot come in on this plank, for I am sure you know better than what you teach.

B. Allowing you to be the **judge**, we thank you for granting salvation to some of us poor heretics, in spite of our heresies. And as you seem to think our greatest crime is in not believing in exclusive immersion, and as you immersionists all believe in water, much water, and water very often, we will try your fortifications along the bank of the Jordan, and of the Red Sea, and see what mental dynamite and theological gun cotton can do with your much boasted bulwarks. So, brother, if you are willing, we will begin with the Word itself, and see if it favors either side of the question, and if so, which side.

W. Well, such mental dynamite as you possess is not calculated to harm anything. I do not believe you would know how to explode what little you do have, and your gun cotton has already been so thoroughly wet with "**much water**," until it will never burn. Nobody is afraid, so just fire away and take your own course. I shall be with you in the sixth trouble, and will not forsake you in the seventh.

B. Well, we will first introduce Mr. Webster, our own standard lexicographer. Hear him: "Baptism. The application of water to a person, as a sacrament, or religious ceremony. * * This is usually performed by sprinkling or immersion." "Baptize. To administer the sacrament of baptism to; to christen." Not to immerse, as is often declared. But further he says: "By some denominations of Christians, baptism is performed by plunging

or immersing the whole body in water. * * * More generally the ceremony is performed by **sprinkling** the water on the face of the person." Thus, Webster gives no specific mode to the words "baptism" and baptize." Yet, to hear you immersionists talk one would think baptize and immerse meant the same thing; but, they do not, any more than shoot and kill mean the same thing. Neither does **immersion mean baptize any more than pour or sprinkle does.** And neither pour, sprinkle nor immerse means to baptize; nor does baptize mean to pour, sprinkle or immerse, if Webster is authority. "Sprinkle," he says, "to scatter, to disperse," etc. "Pour. To flow, to issue forth in a stream," etc. "Immerse. To put under water, or other fluid; to plunge, to dip," etc., but not one word about baptism in the definition of the three words referred to; so they cannot be synonymous with baptize. And no lexicographer can be found who gives baptism as a **definition** of immerse, pour or sprinkle. In fact, the English word "Baptize," or the Greek word "Baptizo," has no specific mode in its meaning, but gives all or any of them. In the Greek the word "Baptizo" has thirty-two meanings. It does mean to immerse, dip, plunge, sink, etc. It also means just as much, to wash, wet, moisten, bedew, sprinkle, pour, etc.

We are free to admit that from the Word itself nothing can be gained by either side on this question.

On page 55 of his book on baptism Mr. Carson says: "My position is it (Baptizo) always signifies to dip, never expressing anything but mode. Now, as I have all the lexicographers and commentators against me in this opinion, it will be necessary to say a word or two with regard to the authority of lexicons."

Then this giant defender of immersion sweeps all lexicographical authority on the mode of baptism away and sets up **his opinion** as the standard; and I am sorry to say his followers in this procedure are numerous.

W. Well, is that the best you can do? Webster's dictionary is of modern make. Webster defines words according to the use made of the words at the time he wrote his book. The idea of quoting from a modern author as authority on the meaning of ancient terms. Mr Webster is himself very careful in stating just what he means in his definition, referring, as he does, to how baptism is now performed. He does not intimate that the original meaning of baptize is sprinkle or pour. He knew better, as does everybody else who knows anything at all about it.

What you declare to be the testimony of Dr. Carson is a palpable misrepresentation of that author. Dr. Carson says the word means to dip only; that is, he denies that it has even a

secondary meaning, as an effect of the dipping, such as to wash, to cleanse, etc. In this matter only does he say the lexicographers are against him. He did not hint, as you try to intimate, that the lexicons were against him in that, they give sprinkle and pour as a definition of baptizo. He knew that no lexicon of note so defined it, and so does every other man who knows anything of the books.

Your statement to the effect, that sprinkle nor pour, either or both together, are equivalent terms to the word baptize, is very correct. Sprinkle means to scatter in drops. The thing you scatter in drops is what you sprinkle—this is the water, and since the thing sprinkled is the thing baptized, it is the water you baptize and not the person upon whom you sprinkle the water. The same would be true of pouring. If baptize means to pour, then the thing poured would be the thing baptized; this is the water always, and not the person upon whom the water is poured. The word baptize means, primarily and otherwise, to dip, to plunge, to immerse, and never to sprinkle and pour.

B. No; emphatically no. Primary means first. Now, Bapto and Baptizo were in use a thousand years before Christ. The Latin language was not in use to any great extent until 250 years before Christ. From Latin we get the word "Immergo," from which we get immerse; hence, the words Bapto and Baptizo were about 750 years old when Immergo was born; and Immergo was about one thousand years old before immerse came into use. So Bapto and Baptizo were about two thousand years old before our English word immerse had an existence.

W. I wonder! But is this not true of sprinkle and pour also? How much older are our English words sprinkle and pour than our English word immerse? Mr. Webster, as quoted by yourself, says immerse means to dip; and it so happens that dip is the translation of the word for baptism in 2 Kings 5-14. The prophet of God told Naaman to baptize himself seven times in the river Jordan, and Naaman understood that to do this he must dip himself which he did. Thus you see that dip and immerse mean today just what their corresponding words meant then. There were words then representing the same ideas found in these words now.

B. Of course there were; and there were words that meant to sprinkle and pour, too. Cheo. to pour, and Rantizo, to sprinkle, are much older than Immergo, to immerse. And all honest men, whether profound scholars or not, admit it; and all honest men, whether scholars of the first water or not, admit it means sprinkle

and pour just as much as it does dip or immerse. But very few people believe in exclusive immersion.

W. And the very fact that Rantizo, to sprinkle, and Cheo, to pour, and that Bapto and Baptizo are also in the Old Testament, never translated by either of the words sprinkle or pour, shows that it never had such a meaning. Your calculation is extravagant, but, if true, it would prove nothing for you. A great majority of the religious world are anti-Christian; but the truth is, a large percent of those you count on the affusion side, more than half perhaps, do not believe that the Bible teaches sprinkling and pouring for baptism.

B. There are 500,000,000 Bible readers in the world. Of these 475,000,000 say the Bible teaches affusion, while only 25,000,000 say it teaches exclusive immersion. Or, to put it in a different light, there are 95 percent for affusion, while only 5 percent are for exclusive immersion. In other words, there are nineteen for the Bible mode of baptism by affusion, while there is **one poor fellow** against it, contending for immersion. Doesn't he look lonesome?

But, Brother Immersionist, let us try this in another light. Say here are twenty doctors. All have read the same books, and all stand on equal grounds for knowing diseases and the remedies. Now, if nineteen say a certain disease is smallpox, and one says no, it is measles, whose opinion would you accept, brother; that of the one, or of the nineteen? Now, brother, if you had had the measles and had not had the smallpox, would you not be getting away from there?

Brother, that is just the strength of the affusionists against the immersionists. Don't you feel shakey?

W. What you state is not true, as a fact. But suppose you were correct in your count. Do you not know that not one in a thousand knows anything about what the Bible teaches on the subject? And the great majority of those who even profess to understand it do not claim that the Bible teaches sprinkling for baptism. They are among the Catholics and Episcopalians, who claim only the authority of the church for the practice. The truth is, figures are against you in the case. But if you want to follow the majority in religion, you would not pretend to be Christian, for the great majority of the people in the religious world are **antiChristian**. If your nineteen doctors have sense enough to be called doctors, they would know the case was one of "smallpox", and not measles. Now what are the facts concerning the meaning of Baptizo? Why, all who are worthy of the name

doctor or even scholar say that Baptizo means to immerse; **not one doctor** will say it means to pour or sprinkle. So you are the "measley little fellow" who stands alone. Have you got sense enough to feel scared or lonesome? Outside of Catholics the majority of religious people have been immersed, not sprinkled.

The nineteen to one are on my side—and you stand alone, supported by your own litle opinion.

B. Hold on, brother; you had better not throw away men's opinions so lightly; for they are all you immersionists have to stand on; and you may need them before we get through.

W. That baptize means to immerse, and never to sprinkle or pour, is not based on an opinion at all, but is a fact. And when I get through answering you according to your folly, I will append some further testimony on the subject.

B. I was baptized by a Methodist preacher. Would you take me into your church on my Methodist baptism?

W. In the first place, I have no church; I am a member of the church of Christ, and I became a member by obeying the truth; that is, by faith, repentance and baptism for the remission of sins. This you would have to submit to, before God would add you to His church.

B. I thought you did not believe in creeds, and yet the very first thing when I propose to join you, you want me to renounce my creed, and let you ram one or two articles of your creed down my throat. Yet, you haven't got one single verse of scripture for your creed, but it is founded on **assumption** and your **opinions**. Now, brother, if you have no creed, you have no belief. For the word creed comes from the Latin word "Credo" I believe." A man's creed is what he believes. Now, have you any belief?

W. You are mistaken, sir. I have no creed but the word of the Lord; that creed is what shuts you out. You, as a Methodist, claim to belong to the old Jewish church. Now all of the first members of the Christian church were Jews, and belonged to the old church, yet they had to be converted and baptized in order to become members of the New Testament church; there was not one exception. Of course the Bible would require the same of you modern "Judaizers." And you know, to the Bible, must all of our appeals be made.

B. Well, I am most happy, then, to go with you to the Bible; for from it I draw my doctrine and by it I try to live. Let

us see, immersion brother, is the word immerse in the Bible? If so, please give me chapter and verse, will you?

W. While the English word immerse is not in the King James version of the scriptures, it is in other translations, some of which are by sprinklers. Even your own father, Mr. Wesley, says the ancient manner of baptizing was by immersion. By the way, do you think that because the English word immerse is not in the King James version, that therefore the idea is not there? Then I suppose you think that because the terms "grandfather and grandmother" are not in the Old Testament, the idea is not there. So I suppose you think they had no grandfathers and grandmothers in those days. Eh! Do you see how simple and silly you make yourself appear. But I can find the equivalent of immerse in the King James version.

B. No, brother, you will not, because you cannot find what does not exist. It is not in King James or the revised version. Neither will you find the expression, "Be baptized in water." They are not there, and of course you cannot find them. The Baptists and Campbellites virtually admit they cannot prove immersion by the authorized version by going off and making one to suit their opinions and to fit their theory. And how signally they fail is evidenced by their self-contradictory versions of the New Testament. Translated by Alvah, Hovey, John A. Broadus and Henry G. Weston of the Baptist church, and A. Campbell of the Campbellite church, each denomination publishes and sends forth its translation, with their shibboleth, "Immerse", in it, where they could make it fit; and where they could not, they used some other word; and yet they put out these translations with the avowed purpose of giving to the public a correct translation of the Greek words Bapto and Baptizo. The Baptists, though in the very first rendering of Baptistes, but Baptist, instead of Immerser, as A. Campbell did, in Mat. 3:-. They ought to have been like Campbell and have rendered it Immerser. That would have been consistency. In Matt. 20:20-23, all about baptize is left out, though the words baptize and baptism are used there six times.

W. You should not complain at the Baptists for putting out a translation of their own. Your father, John Wesley, did the same thing. You live in a glass house; you should not throw stones. Your saying that A. Campbell is the author of the book called "Living Oracles" is false, and you know it. Don't you remember how I made you swallow your own "vomit" on that once in an oral debate? You know that James McKnight, Phillip Doddridge and George Campbell (not Alexander) are the authors of that translation, that those three men were all affusionists and that

A. Campbell never made one suggestion concerning the book which their publishers did not endorse and accept? Now, Mr. Ballard, don't tell that——. Well, don't repeat it again; you know it is not true. Of course what you say about their purposely leaving out a part of the Bible from their translation is all "bosh" and made out of whole cloth. Why would they leave out what you call the baptism of suffering? One thing is certain, Christ's suffering in his death was not a mere sprinkling. It was intense, overwhelming, and hence called a baptism. Do you see? Your opinion in the matter is no good, throw it away, and come to the truth.

B. Stop brother; you threw away all opinions of men a while ago, and now you want to pick them up again; but as you rejected them you cannot bring them into court again. Then too, brother, the opinion of some of the best critics is that it is scripture; so I suppose you and I had better let it alone and stick to the Book. And so, spurious as you and the new translators would have it to be, you all preach from it, keep it lying on your center tables, and endorse a book that has the words baptize and baptism in it—the King James translation—but do not use your own crippled versions. In Luke 12:50 these translators put, "I have an immersion to undergo," instead of, "I have a baptism to be baptized with," as the King James version has it. Now, I submit to you that "undergo" is not given as a definition of Baptizo by any lexicographer that I have examined, and I have searched several for this definition. But there it stands in this version, the child of their opinion. They could not say, "I have an immersion to be immersed in." No good; not even good nonsense. So they manufactured a definition of their own. Yet according to these translators, *immerse* and *immersion* are the only true meanings for Baptizo in the New Testament. Were they not scholars? Where then is the agreement of these wise men, even among themselves? Consistency is a jewel, but a scarce article among immersionists."

W. I have no objection to the King James on this verse, sir. It is my scripture and not yours. As I have said, Christ's suffering in his death was not a mere sprinkling, as you think. It was overwhelming. So immerse may be a translation of Baptizo in this passage, as well as in every other passage in the New Testament. Don't you know at least this much about the matter.

B. No, Brother; you can't be consistent and render the word Baptizo "immerse." Now, let us sum up what we have found:

1. We have found that the word **baptize** neither in the English nor Greek has any model meaning. It may mean any or all modes, or no mode at all.

2. We have found that immerse is not the primary meaning of the word baptizo.

3. We have found that nineteen out of every twenty Bible readers say it teaches sprinkle and pour water for baptism, where only one says it teaches exclusive immersion. Poor fellows. How lonesome.

4. We have found that nineteen out of every twenty scholars believe that Baptizo, and the Bible, teach affusion for baptism.

5. We have found that the word immerse is not in the King James version or the authorized version of the Bible.

6. We have found that the words "baptize in water" are not in the Bible.

7. We have found the immersionists so dissatisfied with the authorized version as to make one of their own; and yet, so dissatisfied with their own deformed offspring as to refuse to bring it out on dress parade by preaching from it or quoting from it for proof text.

Poor children. You only speak the weakness of your mother's cause, and your death groans will only be the birth pangs of a brighter day for your disappointed parents.

Now, Brother Immersionist, think over the facts we have learned until we meet for another talk, which I hope shall be soon. And if you have any scripture or proof for immersion, bring it along. We shall be glad to examine it.

W. I shall answer the items of your summary in the order you gave them.

We have found the word Baptizo does have a definite meaning which is to dip, plunge or immerse, and never to sprinkle or pour.

That immerse is the primary and real meaning of Baptizo.

We have found that the majority of the nineteen sprinklers give no higher authority for the practice than the church; that nearly all of them admit the Bible does not teach it, and that you are the lonesome fellow.

We have found that not one single scholar in the world will say that Baptizo means to sprinkle or pour. No translation so renders it, and no standard lexicon so defines it. We have found the word immerse in a number of translations as good and even bet-

ter than King James, some of them by Pedito-baptists, even John Wesley. But alas for you, sir, not one of them, King James included, ever translates Baptizo by either of the words sprinkle or pour. So I advise that you keep your sympathy for yourself and your brethren. "Poor children," you are left orphans, for your own father deserts you. and says the ancient baptism performed by the apostles was immersion.

I suggest that you think over these matters until another meeting, and see if you cannot have something sensible and true to tell next time.

CHAPTER II.

The Baptisms of the Law.

B. There comes my immersion brother again and from the smile he has on his face, I know he feels like he has a poser for me; so out with it, my good brother, and let us get through with it.

W. Well, you are mistaken, if you think I would ask you a hard question. I find you unable to answer easy questions, so I shall not give you hard ones. Did any one ever tell you what the Greek words for sprinkle and pour are?

B. Certainly they did. Cheo, to pour, and Rantizo, to sprinkle, were in current use in the days of Christ.

W. Christ and His apostles frequently used these words in other connections. How does it happen that they were never used when the idea of baptism was to be expressed? Why did not Christ use one of these words when he said teach and baptize the people?

B. Because Cheo, to pour, and Rantizo, to sprinkle, were never used to express a religious ordinance. This, brother, is an honest answer to a straightforward question. Now, will you be as honest with me? I will ask you a question. Did they not also have words that expressed no other idea than that of an immersion, or hiding away?

W. Do you mean what you say, now, when you state that sprinkle and pour are never used to express a religious ordinance? Are you certain you will not say before we close this conversation, that the sprinklings under the law, which Paul in Hebrews calls ordinances, and which you call ordinances, were baptisms? We shall wait and see. Moreover, does not your blessed little discipline make baptism a religious ordinance? Now, you say that sprinkling and pouring do not express a religious ordinance. Well, I think

you do not understand the meaning of your own admission, but it is about correct as to fact, I expect you have had some one tell you that 'immerse and hide away' mean the same, and that the words in the Greek would be *Kataduo* and *Katakluzo*, but I see you do not understand really what the words are which you have in mind, and I tell you frankly, you have been misinformed. By the way, do you know where in the New Testament these words may be found?

B. Now, brother, be fair—be honest; why did not Christ and his apostles use these two words, if it was immersion they were after?

W. Because Christ had at his command the word he wanted. He wanted a word which means to dip or to immerse. *Baptizo* is that word, and Christ used it when he told his apostles to baptize. Now, the fact that he did not say *Rantize* or *Cheize* shows he did not want any sprinkling or pouring done in his name. But can you talk with any sense on this question?

B. I think I can. First, neither Christ nor his apostles were after immersion, for they neither taught nor practiced it. Second, because neither *Cheo*, *Rantizo*, *Kataduo* nor *Katakluzo* were ever used in connection with a religious ordinance to express that ordinance. But *Baptizo* was a word familiar to all Jews in connection with their ceremonial cleansing, as it had been used ever since they were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea. 1 Cor. 10:1-2. "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all 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." There is the first scriptural use of the word *Baptizo*. Paul says in 1 Cor. 10:6, "These things," meaning baptism as one of them, "were done for our examples." After Moses set up the tabernacle these baptisms multiplied until they reached thirty-two washings or cleansings, all done by sprinkling or pouring, and called by Christ, the Jews and Paul, **baptism**. They are called washings, purifyings and baptisms, in the New Testament, too. I will give them to you in parallel columns:

OLD TESTAMENT

Num. 19:17-19. "And for an unclean person, they shall take of the ashes of the burnt heifer of purification for sin, and running water shall be put there to in a vessel; and a clean person shall take hyssop and dip in the water, and sprinkle it upon the tent, and upon all the vessels, and upon the persons that were there and upon them that touched a bone, or one slain, or one dead, or a grave. And the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean, on the third, and on the

NEW TESTAMENT

King James Version, Mark 7:3-4, "For the Pharisee and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft they eat not, holding the tradition of the elders. And when they come from the market, except they wash they eat not. And many other things be, which they have received to hold, as the washing of cups and pots and brazen vessels, and of tables."

Now, *Baplisontai* washing themselves, and *Bapsitמוש*, washing in verse 4 has reference to the washings, bath-

seventh day; and on the seventh day he shall purify himself (that is he that did the sprinkling), and wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and shall be clean at even."

Now, here are the words bathe, wash, purify, and sprinkle in the Old Testament. What are they called in the New Testament? Again, in 8:6-7 we have the following:

"Take the Levites from among the children of Israel and cleanse them and thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them; sprinkle water of purification upon them, and let them shave all their flesh, and let them wash their clothes, and so make themselves clean." This law was given nineteen years before the law of the burnt heifer, and for a very different purpose.

In Num. 19:1-20 there is blood, ashes and water, but in Num. 8:6-7 there is nothing but water, clean water. And in the 19th verse we have the laying on of hands, in the same service, of which Paul speaks in Heb. 6:1, 2 (see next column) Ver. 10: "And thou shalt bring the Levites before the Lord; and the children of Israel shall put their hands upon the Levites." There in the law it is specifically stated the water should be sprinkled on them, Num. 8:6-7. In the same service of consecration, the laying on of hands is ordered. Now, Paul in Heb. 6:1-2, calls these sprinklings baptisms. (See opposite column).

But let us hear Paul once more on these old Testament sprinklings. Heb. 9:10, where he is describing the services as conducted in the Jewish tabernacle in Moses' day, he says: "Which stood only in meats and drinks." and (Diaphorois Baptismois) "divers washings," which the Baptists translate "various immersions," and the Campbellites, "divers immersions." All these in spite of what the law, Christ, John and Paul say. The law says sprinkle; Christ calls it baptism; John calls it purifying; Paul called it "Diaphorois Baptismois," divers baptisms, or washings, and in verses 13, 19, said it was done by sprinkling; and so the Baptists and Campbellites do likewise in the same verse. "For when Moses had spoken every commandment to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of the calves and of the goats with water and the scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book itself and all the people." Now these immersionists call "Diaphorois Baptismois" "divers immersions," and yet in the same chapter, and without filling their pen again, quote the law saying it was sprinkling.

Now, Brother Immersionist, will you give up and be good?

ings, purifyings and sprinklings of the law in Num. 19:17-19.

The Baptist and Campbellite versions of Mark 7:4. "Immerse themselves," and the "Immersion of cups, pots," etc.

Here Christ called the Old Testament washings done by sprinkling, baptisms.

Again, in John 3:25-26: "Then there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying and they came unto John and said unto him: Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bearest witness, behold the same baptizeth, and all men come to him."

Here, in the New Testament, the Jewish purifyings are baptisms, in the King James translation. In the Baptist and Campbellite versions they are called immersions, though God, who ordered them, said they should be performed by sprinkling.

Again, we have seen that John and Christ called these Old Testament sprinklings baptisms.

Now, let us call Paul to the stand and get his testimony. In Heb. 6:1-5, "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 doctrines of baptisms, and of laying on of hands." There Paul calls the sprinklings of Num. 2 and 6 to 7, baptisms, while the Campbellites and Baptists, in their version call them immersions. How pitiable the cause!

W. Now, you have talked a long time; you have had free course, and you have glorified yourself with ignorance and stupidity. To say, or even think, that the baptisms mentioned by Paul in Heb. 6:2, also 9:10, have the faintest allusion to the sprinklings under the law betrays palpable ignorance in any one, and surely it is a very great surprise to find it in a preacher.

Why, my dear sir, have you no self-pride or self-respect? Paul had too much sense to intimate the sprinklings under the law were baptisms, for he knew that sprinkling was in no sense baptism, that baptism could not be performed in any such way. Baptize means to immerse, not to sprinkle. Besides, in all the sprinklings under the law, water only, unmixed water, was never used, not in one case. I challenge you or any other Methodist preacher on earth to show one case where unmixed water was ever sprinkled on any one in any age of the world as a religious rite. I will give you until the judgment day to meet this challenge. The water used in sprinkling was a mixture always of blood, oil or ashes; water alone was never used in their sprinklings. Your reference to the red heifer, in the 19th chapter of Numbers, will explain this. Are you simple enough to think that was a baptism?

But you quote from Numbers 8, and you suggest that this was a case in which water only was used; for it was nineteen years, you say before the law of the burnt heifer was given in the 19th chapter; but you only guess that it was water only. It does not hint such a thought. It is called "water of purifying," not water only; and this was mixed water always.

Read the 8th chapter of Leviticus, and you will find that the water of purifying mentioned in Num. 8 had blood in it, and never repeat again that it was water only.

In regard to John's baptism being numbered with the Jewish purifications, as you seem to think, I will say that it is really too silly to deserve notice. However, I think we shall have occasion to discuss John's baptism in another chapter of our talks.

Now having exposed your claims as shown in scripture readings in parallel columns from the Old and New Testament, I shall show you just what Paul had in mind when he spake of divers baptisms in the 6th and 9th chapters of Hebrews. First, I wish to inform you that there were about twenty sprinklings under the law. Eight of these were of blood. Of blood and oil there were three, of blood and water two, of oil three, mixed water and oil four, making twenty in all.

As I have said before, I will repeat: **Water alone was never sprinkled on any one as a religious rite.** In the New Testament, baptism was associated with water only; even water in its native

place, as, for instance, John's baptizing in the River Jordan. Now, who is simple enough to suppose that when Paul used the word baptism in Hebrews, the 6th and 9th chapters, he referred to the sprinklings under the law where water **only was never used**. Of course he did not; but he referred to the eighteen bathings under the law, in which water only was always used, the entire body being washed in each case. These bathings were always expressed by the Greek word *louo*, which means to wash the whole body. These bathings occurred thousands of times every year. So Paul calls them *Diaphorois Baptismois*, divers washings (baptisms) in Heb. 9:10. But I will give you a diagram on the order of your own, and perhaps you can understand that, however dull you may be of comprehension.

That there were sprinklings under the law and sprinklings under Christ, we all know to be true, and that there were bathings under the law called baptisms by Paul, and that there is a water baptism in the New Testament is also a fact. It may be easily understood by the following diagram:

OLD TESTAMENT

Sprinklings under the law.
Water only never used; but water of purifying, mixed water, (See Num. 8th chapter, also Num. 19th chapter).
Bathings under the law. Water only always used. (Lev. 14:8; 2 Kings 5-10:14; other references could be given, but these are sufficient to show the facts).

Sprinklings under Christ.
Hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience. (See Heb. 10-22, first part of the verse).

Baptism under Christ. Water only always used. (Heb. 10-22; latter part of the verse; also, Acts 8:37-38; Acts 10:48).

Now, in your own words, my friend, "be good" for once in your life at least, and acknowledge that which you can not fail to see, and that is, that the divers baptisms referred to by Paul in the 6th and 9th chapters of Hebrews were the bathings under the law, and not the sprinklings.

B. But sprinkle is in the Bible sixty times, and pour 148 times, and baptize with water eight times, so our mode is expressed in the Bible 216 times, while yours, brother, is not in the Bible one single time, either expressed or implied. Now, you be good and come over; join us on our Bible made creed, and throw away that old creed of yours, that has for its foundation nothing but opinions and presumptions.

Now brother, I have shown by the law, by Christ, by John and by Paul, that the washings, bathings, purifyings and sprinklings of the Old Testament are the baptisms of the New. Last, but not least in this case, I have proven it by your own translations, and they indorsed as the best translations ever made. Will you give up brother, and be good, after all this evidence against you?

I shall be delighted to talk with you about the baptism of Christ; for if he was immersed I want to know it. But I forewarn you, Jordan is a hard road to travel for an immersionist. So be wide awake and duly prepared.

W. But neither of your sixty sprinklings or the 148 pourings refer to baptism in any sense whatever so they do you no good.

I shall be glad to teach you the truth in regard to the baptism of Christ in the river of Jordan which may be a hard road for a Methodist preacher to travel when he has to go down into it, since they seem to despise it so much; for them I guess it is hard, but for those who know and believe the truth it is a very pleasant road, indeed. They delight to go into the Jordan just as the savior did for baptism, after having walked so long a distance that he might be baptized in the river of Jordan.

I shall try to be awake when we meet again, but in the meantime I assure you that I will lose no sleep over a dread of you, or of what you may have to say, for a talk with you is a soft snap, indeed. If I have any fears of you, it will be that you may run off before I am through with you but maybe you will stand to the rack. Good-bye, if you call that gone.

CHAPTER III.

The Baptism of Christ.

B. John was a priest under the law, and could not baptize any one except according to the law. Christ was born under the law, lived and died under the Jewish law, and had no other baptism except that prescribed by the Mosaic law. Read Matt. 5: 17-18 "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." "For verily I say unto you till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, until all be fulfilled." Christ said he came to fulfill or keep the law, not to destroy or break it. Then when he came to John to be baptized of him, he came to fulfill the law. Matt. 3:15. And Jesus answering said unto him: 'Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness;' then he suffered him." Here, to keep the law, or to fulfill all righteousness, means the same thing. It can mean nothing else. And Christ made this argument to John, that He and John would be keeping the law or fulfilling all righteousness, by John's baptizing him. Then it follows that John was baptizing according to law, and the law says it shall be done by **sprinkling**, the Immersionists themselves being witness. See their version of Heb. 9:10: "For when Moses had spoken every commandment to all the peo-

ple according to the law, he took the blood of the calves, and of the goats with water, scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book itself and all the people." Now, if Christ and John kept the law, and the law says sprinkle, then John sprinkled the water on Christ, or John and Christ broke the law, which Christ says He came to keep; and they both would have been stoned before they came out of the water, if John had immersed Christ.

W. Who told you that John was a priest, and that he baptized Christ as an act of a Jewish priest? Don't you know that John did not do his baptizing by the authority of Moses' law? Christ in John 1:6 says "John was sent from God," not from Moses and when Christ asked the Pharisees whence came John's baptism, they were afraid to say, but if John had been a Jewish priest and baptizing as a priest, Christ would not have been foolish enough to ask the question in the first place, and certainly the Pharisees would have readily informed the Savior where John got his authority to baptize. Why the fact that John was called "The Baptist" shows that he was administering something new, and not some old Jewish rite that had been in vogue for centuries. Haven't you got sense enough to see that? Your passage in Heb. 9:10 is not a forty-second cousin to an imitation of a baptism, and no Immersionist or any one else who understands what baptism is has ever said so. The law does not say sprinkle for baptism, neither does any other part of God's word. That is only the hallucination of a misguided brain, sir; there is not a bit of truth in it. But do not think that Christ did nothing more than what Moses in the law taught.

B. Yes, to the jot and tittle. They were circumcised the 8th day, presented in the temple to be dedicated to God on the 40th day. They entered on their priestly office at the age of thirty years, and kept the passover, all in strict accordance with the law and usages of the Jewish church. The last act of public worship in which Christ engaged, was to take the Jewish passover, which none but a ceremonially clean Jew dared to do. See Num. 9:4-12. I will quote you the sixth verse, "And there were certain men who were defiled by the body of a dead man, that they could not keep the passover on that day (that is, on the 14th day of the first month), and they came before Moses, and before Aaron on that day." Compare Luke 22:15: "And he said unto them. With desire have I desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer." Still a member of the Jewish synagogue and keeping the Mosaic law. And I challenge any man living to find a single act of Christ, or one word spoken by him that is not in perfect keeping with the spirit of the Old Testament and Mosaic Law. So, He could not have been immersed. But, I see my immersion brother has his hand up again, wanting to ask me a question. So, I will quit

the law long enough to answer him. What is it, now, brother?

W. You mistake. I have no question to ask you, lest I should be found tantalizing the simple minded. I only wish to say that your ignorance of the scriptures seems more and more apparent as our talks continue. Why, sir; you seem to think that Christ was baptized into his priestly office. When Paul says he could not be a priest on earth at all. Heb. 8:4. He was not a priest after the order of Aaron. He was made a priest since the law. Heb. 7:11-28. You say he was after the order of Aaron, and that the law made him a priest. Is it possible you do not know anything about the Bible?

Your challenge to any man to show where Christ ever spoke a word not in harmony with the Mosaic law is, if possible, a worse exposure of your ignorance of his words. Say, did you ever read the Sermon on the Mount? If not, go read it, and be ashamed of yourself. See Matt. 5:27 to close of the chapter. See where Christ quotes from Moses and then says, "But I say unto you," quite a different thing. Pshaw! Why, you seem to know absolutely nothing of the sayings of Christ even. Better learn the truth and obey it. Go down into the water like Christ did when he was baptized.

B. The Bible does not say that, nor anything like it. The Bible nowhere says Christ **went into the water**, and if it did, it does not say he was immersed; but it does say John baptized **with water**, and not in it. He applied the water to the candidate, and not the candidate to the water, as you immersionists do.

W. It is stated very positively that he came up **out of the water**. Do you suppose he could have done this without first having gone down into it? Do You think the phrase baptized **with water** proves sprinkling and not immersion?

In the sentence the smith cools his iron with water. Do you think he does this by sprinkling the water on the hot iron, or does he not do it by dipping the heated iron in the water? Eh! The physician cured his patient with quinine. Does this expression show how the quinine was applied? Besides, Christ went into the river and was baptized, and then he came out of the water. This shows he was not sprinkled. He was not fool enough to have gone into the river to receive that which could have been more easily done without going into the water. He was baptized, and that means to immerse, and never to sprinkle. **Never.**

B. Yes, the Bible says he came up out of the water, but I have been in water many times and was not immersed. Then, the words "out of" are an awkward translation of the preposition "apo," any way. In this place and in forty-four other places in

the Bible they translated it out of, and in 370 other places they translated it "from," as they should have done in Matt. 3:16, and as was done by the version of 1886, also by the Baptists in the version of 1883. Here it is, Matt. 3:16: "And having been immersed, Jesus came up straightway **from** the water." The Englishman's Greek New Testament puts it, "Jesus went up immediately from the water." The learned Carson, a Baptist of no mean degree, says: "It is said, 'Jesus when he was baptized, went up straightway **from** the water'. I admit that the proper translation of apo is from, not out of." So the immersionists surrender this point, and had not the King James translation made the mistake of putting out of instead of from, we should have been saved much of the present day contention about the mode of baptism. But my immersion brother won't keep his hand down as long as he thinks he has one inch of water to immerse in, and I must answer him. What is it now, brother?

W. Well, I wonder if you would challenge the King James translation on anything? Do you know that other translations, even sprinklers, translate, "John baptized in water," and not with water? And do you know that in one statement of the Savior's baptism we have **ek** and not apo, and that ek always means **out of** and not from, and that it is therefore a fact that Christ came up out of the water when he was baptized? If you do not understand these matters, and you know that I know that you know you do not, I advise that you talk about something you may know something about. Stay nearer the edge of the water. That is the place for small fish like you are, anyway.

In reference to your picture, which you say is the oldest picture of Christ's baptism, I want to inform you that it is a picture of the anointing with oil, after the baptism. His immersion had already occurred, and what you show is the anointing after the baptism. You thought it was the act of baptism being performed by sprinkling. Really, however, I doubt if you thought so since you only show the picture and say nothing about it. You ought to feel ashamed of the forgery.

As for my being particularly anxious about immersion, I can not say that I am; I am only amused at your excitement and your blunders. The New Testament is too plain on the subject of baptism to give cause for fear upon the part of those who believe it, for example; it is called a burial and a resurrection in the 6th chapter of Romans.

B. No, sir; the word water is not in the 6th chapter, nor indeed is it in the whole book of Romans. Read and see.

W. Neither are the words Holy Ghost in the chapter. Yet

I understand you think the baptism here referred to is Holy Ghost baptism. So the legs of the lame are not equal, are they? Paul says by this baptism we get into Christ's death.

B. Yes, to be sure, he does, but death does not mean water, does it?

W. Neither does death mean Holy Ghost, does it? The truth is, the water is the element in which they were baptized. The death of Christ was not the element, and no one ever taught that it was, and you knew it. Then why were you so unmanly as to say that they did?

B. No. The word water is not in the book of Romans. Nor does it represent the baptism of Christ by John at all. How many baptisms did Christ have? 1. He was baptized by John with water. 2. He was baptized with the Holy Ghost. Matt. 3:16. Then he had the baptism of **suffering**, Luke 12:50. Now, brother, which one of these baptisms do you say Paul referred to in Rom. 6:1-3?

W. The baptism of Christ is not contemplated in the passage. It is the baptism of the people here spoken of; by that baptism they were buried and raised again. It is true that John baptized Christ with (or rather in water), but in doing so he immersed the Savior in the river of Jordan. Christ was never baptized with the Holy Ghost. That baptism was to give the ability to speak with tongues. Christ did not need such a baptism.

B. But you admitted the baptisms of the law were by affusion, and Christ was baptized under the law, and hence it can not refer to his water baptism; for it was done by sprinkling. So you are left again. Then, too, the element we are buried in, in Romans, is **death**; so stated by the apostle.

W. I have shown that no kind of sprinkling is any akin to baptism. I have also shown that Christ's baptism was not prescribed by the law, and as to the element in which the baptism of the passage was performed, it is water, not death; we reach the death of Christ in the baptism. Don't you know what element would mean in the case? But if death is the element, the Holy Ghost is not the element. Then what becomes of your claims?

B. Then in verse 6 Paul says, "We are crucified with him." Surely there is no resemblance between a crucifixion and an immersion. And if the baptism referred to here does not represent the death of Christ, it should be by pouring. Read Is. 53:12, "Because he hath **poured out** his soul unto death." So it is by pouring. If you say it represents his great suffering, then still it must be by affusion, for in Is. 53:4 we have: "Surely he has borne our griefs

and carried our sorrows." Verse 5: "The chastisement of our peace was upon him and with His stripes we are healed 6: "And the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." So none of these will do for your immersion theory, but fit well the affusionist. "Borne," "carried," upon," "laid on," do not fit immersion.

W. Then I suppose when you sprinkle persons, you lie down on them, and compel them to bear you, and carry you, do you? Such nonsense; Christ poured out his soul in death, but that is not baptism. The intense, overwhelming suffering and sorrow was the baptism of suffering. In baptism we are buried and resurrected, and this may be done only by immersion, representing a burial and resurrection.

B. I will let Christ answer that question. See Matt. 26: 7-12: "There cometh unto him a woman having an alabaster box of very precious ointment, and poured it on his head as he sat at meat. In the 12th verse we have the following words in reference to this anointing: "For in that she hath poured this ointment on my body, she did it for my burial." See, on his head, on his body, all by pouring and for his burial. Now turn and Read Matt. 12: 39-40: "Then certain of the scribes and Pharisees answered, saying, Master, we would see a sign from thee. But he answered and said unto them, "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas; for as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so also shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."

Now, Brother Immersionist, will you ever say again that **water baptism represents the death, burial and resurrection of Christ**, when he himself said there should no sign be given of it but that of the prophet Jonas? If you do you will dispute your Lord's word, and I will let him settle that with you at the judgment.

W. You ought to be ashamed, sir. What you say is an insult to all decent people. Christ said (Matt. 12:39-40) that the only sign given to a "**wicked and adulterous**" generation was the sign of the prophet Jonas. This may apply to you, but it does not to those who believe the truth. Is not the Lord's supper a sign of Christ's death? What is the matter with you, anyway? But I think you have some more silly stuff to say about the 6th chapter of Romans. Let us have it.

B. Well, then, if you will turn and read 1 Cor. 12:13 you will find this language: "For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been all made to drink into one spirit." This

is the baptism spoken of in Rom. 6:1-6, which kills us to sin, but makes us alive to God; that puts us into the merits of Christ's atoning death and makes us walk in newness of life; that crucifies us to the world, and the lust of the flesh, but makes us alive to the glories of God and the power of the Holy Ghost. Thus have we exploded the fallacy of Christ's being immersed, and of our being buried with him "in the liquid grave of baptism."

W. Yes; I knew what you were going to say, and like everything else you have said, in these talks, it is as far from being true as that which the Pharisees said when they called Christ a devil. "By one spirit are we all baptized into one body" can not mean Holy Ghost Baptism. In Holy Ghost baptism the Holy Ghost was the element, and not the agent, as in this case. Again, after the baptism here mentioned and as a result of it they were made to "**drink into the spirit,**" which shows it was not Holy Ghost baptism. Moreover, there was but one baptism at this time. See 1 Cor. 1st chapter. Men could not administer Holy Ghost baptism, only God could do that. But there was but one baptism at the time Paul wrote the verse, and man administers it. So Holy Ghost baptism was even at that early date (about A. D. 60) a thing of the past. It gave those receiving it power to speak with tongues. You have never had it, for you can not speak correctly in one tongue, much less many. The apostles were baptized under the direction of the spirit, hence those whom they baptized were baptized by the one spirit (by its authority), and were in this way brought into the one body or church. Eph. 1:22-23.

CHAPTER IV.

The Prophets on Baptism.

B. Well, Brother Immersionist, you are here for another talk on the scriptures, are you?

W. Well, yes; and to give you another drubbing over your ungodly or unscriptural practice on the action of baptism. I think you folks try to prove sprinkling and pouring by the prophets. I thought I would expose you on that, too.

B. I shall be glad to talk with you about the prophets; but before I do, I would like to ask you a few questions in regard to them. There will be no hard ones, I assure you. First, I want to ask you, do you believe the prophets foretold the coming of Christ?

W. I do. Do you, and do you doubt what they say?

B. Oh, no; I only want to know how you stand on the authority of the prophets and what they foretold. Do you believe

the prophets were inspired by the Holy Ghost in writing their prophecies, and that these were fulfilled in Christ?

W. All the prophets said concerning Christ was fulfilled. But some things prophesied remain yet to be fulfilled.

B. Now, Brother, Immersionist, I am glad to hear you talk that way. You do not reject a part of God's word as many of your immersion people do, or take some one's opinion about it. You seem to be searching for the light from the true source of all knowledge, the Bible. And as we have agreed that the prophets foretold Christ's coming, what he should do and how he should do it, let us examine the following prophecies of Christ: Is. 44:3-6: "For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground; I will pour my spirit upon thy seed and my blessings upon thine offspring; and they shall spring up as among the grass, as willows by the water courses. One shall say, I am the Lord's, and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob, and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the Lord, and surname himself by the name of Israel. Thus saith the Lord, the king of Israel, and his Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts, I am the first, and I am the last, and beside me there is no God.

Here we have Christ speaking of himself, when he should come. He was then to pour the spirit on the people, verse 3, which action John, Christ and the apostles all called **baptism**. Do you believe that, Brother Immersionist?

W. You are mistaken, the immersionists do not reject any part of God's word. 'Tis the affusionists who do that. Isa. 44:3-6 has no reference to the mission of Christ motely or remotely. neither does John, Christ or any apostle say or intimate that the act of pouring is baptism. They have too much sense to say such a foolish thing. Stay with the truth, and you will do better.

B. Oh, yes; I know. So we shall now quote the other part of Is. 44:3, about water, and see if you will accept that readily. "For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground." Now, if "pour my spirit" means spiritual baptism, then "pour water" must mean water baptism, must it not, especially when they stand in the same verse?

W. To be sure. You seem to think every time God promises to send a rain on the earth he means baptism.. Isaiah is here promising that God will send many blessings upon the Jews. I wonder you do not call Noah's flood a baptism; I guess you would if there had not been "much water there." This passage has no reference to Christ's work. You might as well apply it to the man in the moon.

B. Yes, to be sure it might, could, would or should have been some one else to have given the immersionist a loop-hole to slip out; but it was not. For, in verse 6 we have: "Thus saith the Lord, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts." There is no dodging it, brother; it is Christ speaking.

Then, too, the New Testament says, 2 Pet. 1:21: "For the prophecy came not in old time, by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." so, if Isaiah or some other man might, could, would or should have written Is. 44:3-6, it was done by the order of the Holy Ghost, and he makes no mistakes, brother. If I were you I would be afraid to quibble over a plain declaration of scripture. For, what Christ in Isaiah called pour, in Acts 1:5 he called baptism. What are you going to call them from now on?

W. That does not help you out one bit. The passage is too plain to admit of a quibble. Jacob's descendants, the Jews, fleshly Israel, and literal Jerusalem, are the things talked about. No baptism in the passage. Christ does not call pouring baptism, and no one knows this better than yourself. Aren't you sick of this passage? Don't you want to try another one?

B. Then let us examine another passage in Is. 52:15: "So shall he sprinkle many nations." Here is another specific action foretold of Christ, what he would do when he came. "**Sprinkle many nations.**" Now, if this had been written, "So shall he immerse many nations," every immersionist would have had his Bible thumb-worn at this place; and I would not have been talking to you about sprinkling and pouring. The above scriptures forever settle the mode Christ was to use when he baptized; and as the apostles got their authority from Christ, it settles how they were to baptize. But, my immersion brother, not willing to give up so long as he has one inch of imagination to rest on, is ready to ask another question, and we are ready to hear him.

W. If you had been honest enough to have quoted the passage it would have convicted you of deceit. Without comment I will quote it for you:

Isa. 52:14-15, "As many were astonished at thee; his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men:

"So shall he sprinkle many nations; the kings shall shut their mouths at him: for that which had not been told them shall they see; and **that** which they had not heard shall they consider."

The reference is to the fact that in the death of the Savior the people would be astonished, and hence in the margin of the revised version we have the word "**startle**" instead of sprinkle. The

word for sprinkle in the Septuagint is *Thamadzo*, not *Baptizo* a translation from the Hebrew word *Nazah*, which means to cause "to wonder," "to surprise," "to startle." No baptism predicted here, sir; and besides, did you know that Christ in person did not baptize any one? Gesenius in his Hebrew Lexicon, translates the passage, "So shall he cause many nations to rejoice in himself."

B. I will let John answer that. See John 3:26: "And they came unto John, and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan to whom thou bearest witness behold the same baptizeth, and all men come unto him." Now read John 4:2: "Though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples." Here it is plainly stated that what the disciples did under Christ was attributed to Christ, and done by his authority. Now, if these baptisms by the apostles were said to be done by Christ, because done by his authority, and the prophets said he should "pour" and "sprinkle" the water, then the apostles baptized by sprinkling and pouring, or there is no truth in logic, or scripture. And by the authority of this same Christ the apostles in Matt. 28:19 were commissioned and sent forth when he said: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name (or authority of, for that is what in the name of means' of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Thus Isaiah foretold that Christ should sprinkle or baptize many or all nations through his disciples. So away with that figment of a watery grave, and of being immersed with Christ, when the Bible plainly says he should sprinkle and pour the water on the nations, and commanded the disciples in his authority, or power, to baptize all nations, showing that He and his disciples understood the words sprinkle and pour in the Old Testament to mean baptize in the New. Now, Brother Immersionist, are you satisfied?

W. Why, sir, your reference says, that Christ in person did not do the baptizing, "Christ baptized not, but his disciples." It is true, Christ authorized his apostles, not to baptize nations, as you say, but to teach the nations and baptize the taught, but no prophet ever said this should be done by pouring or sprinkling. Baptize never means to sprinkle; it means to immerse, and hence when the apostles baptized they buried, and resurrected the person baptized. See Col. 2:12: "Buried with him in baptism wherein also ye are risen." Christ and his apostles were not foolish enough to believe or even imagine that such a thing should be done by sprinkling or pouring. They knew also, that no Old Testament writer was foolish enough to intimate such a thing. Now, I have taken all your proof texts from you, so you will have to go elsewhere. Good day.

CHAPTER V.

Places of Baptism.

B. Well, Brother Immersionist, you look worried this morning; are you in trouble?

W. Not a particle worried, sir; nor in any trouble. I never felt better, nor had less to do in my life. I have reached a verdict with reference to yourself, however, which I should not mind expressing, if you wish to hear it.

B. What is that verdict, brother? Let us have it.

W. Well, sir; I have no hesitancy in expressing it. It is this, I am sure you are about the worst confused man I have seen lately and one of the weakest ones I have ever met. Why, sir. if my boy ten years old did not know more about the Bible than you seem to know, I should feel like chastising him for his ignorance of the scriptures.

B. Stop, brother, stop; don't inject your feelings into this discussion. You know you did away with all creeds and opinions, and demanded of me a thus saith the Lord. Now, brother, give me a thus saith the Lord for immersion, or I must, by your own ruling, refuse to hear you.

W. All right. Col. 2:12, "Buried with him in baptism wherein also you are risen," is that not enough? Besides, when Phillip baptized the Eunuch they went down into the water for the baptism, and after the baptism they came up out of it. Acts 8:38. Again when John baptized the people he went into the river to do it. See Mark 1st chapter. How does that strike you? I can give you more, if you want it.

B. Don't be in a hurry, Brother Immersionist, about the places of baptism. I will get there directly. You will wish you were somewhere else, and be as anxious to leave them as you are now to get to them. Let me ask you a few questions, then we will come to your coveted point. If a government has the same ruler, the same laws, and the same kind of subjects, is it not the same kingdom, or government? Were not Christ and John circumcised on the 8th day, and were they not carried into the temple at forty days of age, to be dedicated to God, according to the law of Moses? Lev. 12:2-6. Now read Luke 2:22-23: "And When the days of purification, according to the law of Moses, were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord, as is written in the law of the Lord. Did they not both wait until they were thirty years old before they entered on their priestly office, just as the law said they should?"

W. Well, if I understand what you mean by all of your questions, I answer no to all of them. It is certain that the New Testament church or kingdom is not the old Jewish institution, neither had it been established when John was beheaded. Christ said, after John's death, "I will build my church." Matt. 16:18. All of the first members of the New Testament church had been members of the old institution, had been circumcised and dedicated to the Lord, as you call it, yet they had to be baptized to be members of the new one. Christ told Nicodemus, who was a ruler in the old church, that he must be born again, of water and of the spirit in order to even see the new one. John 3:3-5. Why, Mr. Wesley, your own father, says in his note on Eph. 2:15, that since the death of Christ we have a "new church." Again, we have a new law. Paul says in Heb. 7:12, "The priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." Christ was not made a priest according to the law. Paul states positively that he was not. See Heb. 7:11. He was after the order of Melchisedec, "without beginning of days." So his days were not thirty years, when his priesthood began. He is a priest "after the power of an endless life and not after the law of a carnal commandment." See Heb. 7:16. The law was taken out of the way, when he nailed it to his cross. Col. 2:14 and in Heb. 7:28 Paul says Christ was made a priest "by the word of the oath, which was since the law," and therefore since the cross, and then in Heb. 8:4 he says "Christ should not be a priest while on the earth," and Zech. says, 1:13, he must be on his throne to be a priest. All of this was true of him after his ascension and not before. So away with your nonsense about when, where and how Christ became a priest. You are altogether wrong about the matter. If John was a priest it is more than I know and more than you or any one else knows. The truth is, John did not do the work of a priest in anything. What you say about this matter is **bosh**, and as false as Satan. But what about the places of baptism?

B. Well, I am coming to that now. But did Christ or John or any of the disciples have any book of scriptures, except the Old Testament, for thirty years after the resurrection of Christ?

W. They did not need the Old Testament scriptures that they might know what to teach. John was full of the Holy Ghost from his birth; Christ possessed it without measure, and the apostles taught by plenary inspiration and not simply as they learned it from the old scriptures. Didn't you know that?

B. Did the apostles open the scriptures to the Gentiles until Peter went to Cornelius, which was eight years after the crucifixion?

W. Peter did not open the scriptures to Cornelius. Cor-

nelius already had them, and was under them and by their authority a convert to the Jews religion. Peter preached the gospel to Cornelius, and baptized him, by the authority of the last commission, and not by the authority of anything Moses had ever said. Do you think the amount of ignorance you betray in this helps you out on the mode of baptism?

B. It has much to do with mode, as you will see. Does the place where a thing is done make a change in how it is done.

W. No of course not; but all the essentials and conditions necessary to the thing done must be present in each case.

B. Then, if the law, the prophets, John, Christ, and the apostles all agree that sprinkling and pouring are baptism, the place where it is performed will make no change in the law, will it?

W. But the law, Christ nor John and neither of the apostles ever said sprinkling and pouring ("are") baptism? I have taught you that already; why do you keep repeating it? John baptized in the river of Jordan, which shows that he immersed, not sprinkled.

B. Stop brother. Don't conclude so fast. Just read Mark 1:4, "**John did baptize in the wilderness.**" Now, if in the Jordan means that John immersed in the water, then in the wilderness ought to mean he immersed in the soil of the wilderness, for it says he baptized in the wilderness just as much as it says he baptized in Jordan. Then you keep forgetting that John baptized under the law, and the law says **sprinkle**, and John says **with water**, not in it. But as you rely on the words in **Jordan**, let us cite you to another scripture, which says in Jordan, meaning the brink of the water. Josh. 3:8, "And thou shalt command the priests that bear the ark of the covenant, saying when ye have come to the brink of the water, of the river of Jordan, ye shall stand still in Jordan." Now, does this mean they were immersed? If you think so, I will read you the 17th verse: "And the priests that bore the ark of the covenant of the Lord stood firm on dry ground in the midst of Jordan." Does this look like a clear case of immersion, brother?

W. Then I suppose if you baptize a man in a house, you would sprinkle some of the particles of the material of which the house was made on him, would you? John said he used water in baptizing, and not dirt. And he went into the water to do it, too. The priests did not go into the Jordan, neither the plain of Jordan, nor the river of Jordan for baptism. If they had they would have gone into the water far enough and deep enough for immersion, for that is what the word baptize means.

B. I am glad your vision is getting cleared a little. Now,

brother, "in Jordan" simply tells where the people were baptized, but does not tell how. Just as our soldiers were killed "in Cuba," does not tell how they were killed. But you say our soldiers were killed in Cuba by the Spaniards with Mauser rifles, and you know how they were killed. Then, too, we say whip a boy with a switch means to apply the switch to the boy, not the boy to the switch, so the water is applied to the candidate, not the candidate to the water, as you immersionists do. I wish you immersionists would quit putting the cart before the horse it looks awkward.

W. To be sure, but the fact that our soldiers went into Cuba before they were killed by the Spaniards shows that they had to go into Cuba to be so killed; that is, they could not have been killed by the Spaniards without going into Cuba; and the fact that John went into the waters of the Jordan to baptize shows that he could not do the thing that he did (baptize) without going into the water, and this proves conclusively that he did not sprinkle or pour, which could have been done better without going into the water.

True, if you whip your boy with a switch you may indeed apply the switch to the boy, but when a woman washes her clothes with 'pearline' she puts the powder in the water and then dips, immerses, the clothes in the water. The smith cools his iron with water by dipping the iron in the water, and this is the way John baptized, he dipped or immersed the people in the water. Moreover, the correct translation of the particle *en* is *in*, and not with, so John baptized in water after all. My horse and cart are arranged right and in good trim, but the trouble with you is, you have neither horse nor cart. If you ever did have, your horse starved to death for the want of water, and your cart fell to staves for a like reason. Better stay near "much water," my friend, like John did when he baptized in "Aenon because there was much water there."

B. Yes, that is what the Methodist, or King James Bible says. You immersionists showed you were dissatisfied with it, because you could not prove immersion in it, and went off and made one to suit yourselves, thus setting this one aside. There was not a Methodist by name on earth when the King James translation was made, in A. D. 1611. This translation was made by Episcopalians, who at that time, according to their practice, and according to Mr. Wall, who was a member of that church in A. D. 1664-1727, preferred immersion. Now, if immerse had been the proper rendering they would have given it that way; giving John 2:23, "And John was *immersing* in Aenon near to Salem, because there was much water there," but they did not, because they could

not, without being inconsistent, as all immersionists are. For John did not immerse, but sprinkled the people, as the law directed him to do.

W. You mistake. The best translation for the Methodists would be the Catholic, the production of your grandmother. There is not one word of Methodist doctrine in King James translation. It was the Methodists, and not the immersionists, who showed dissatisfaction with King James and "went off" and made a Bible of their own. You know Mr. Wesley did that. You are also incorrect in the statement, that the translators were immersionists; they were not they were sprinklers, and besides that they were under rules or laws which forbade their translating the word Baptize. They had to anglicize it, and so they give us baptize for Baptizo. They did not translate it at all. If they had translated the word, as scholars, they would have given us the word immerse just as all scholars do. But do you know why John baptized where there was much water?

B. Because much people went to John's baptism, and it took much water for them to drink, to wash clothes, to cook with, and for their stock.

Then, brother, had you ever thought, it does not take much water to immerse one in? Look at that church yonder. It has a baptistry in it, and a few barrels of water will immerse one in it, and what will immerse one will immerse a thousand; so it was not much water to immerse in that he wanted. But if it was much water he wanted to immerse in, why did he leave Jordan? There was a million times more water in Jordan at that time than in Aenon. For Joshua 3:1, says: "For Jordan overfloweth all its banks, all the time of harvest." Now, according to the best data we have John was at Aenon about this time. And Jordan was muddy, not fit to drink, cook with, wash in, nor baptize with.

W. I have always observed that a Methodist preacher thought more about something to eat and drink than he did about doing the will of God. Now you know there is not a word of truth in what you here suggest. The passage emphatically says that John baptized there because there was much water there; that he used the water for baptizing, and not to drink and cook with. Do you know the danger of adding to God's word? Read. Rev. 22:18. John baptized there because there was much water he used the water for baptizing that is to immerse in. But why would they go there to get water to drink and to cook with? There was more of that in Jerusalem than anywhere else. Why not stay in Jerusalem, where they would have all that with other conveniences for cooking? Pshaw! My

friend, you talk silly. Had you not better go to the Red Sea next?

B. Why, brother, have you given up the "in Jordan" argument and gone off to the Red Sea? Did you find Jordan a hard road to travel? But I will attend to the Red Sea baptism right now. I will just let three writers of the Bible settle that point. These three inspired penmen spoil your pretty case of immersion. Read Exodus 14:22, where they passed through the sea. Let Moses speak;" And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon dry ground." Now Moses, who was there, leading the host, says they were on dry ground. Did you ever see a dry ground immersion, brother?

W. Jordan was an easy road for me, but hard indeed for you, just as the Red Sea is. You ask if I ever saw an immersion on dry ground? I answer, as often perhaps as you have seen persons walk on dry ground in the midst of a pouring rain, and you know that is the way you claim they were baptized. But I will let you tell it in your own words, and then, just as I have done in every case, I will expose the fallacy of your claims.

B. I admit this is the first baptism of the Bible and I admit it was before the giving of the law, and that God was the administrator, and that Paul said it was for our example; for in 1 Cor. 10:2 he says: "And were all baptized unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea." Verse 6: "And these things were for our examples." And I am glad to hear you admit them. Now let us quote Ps. 77:16-20, where David is speaking of the children of Israel crossing the Red Sea. He says: "The water saw thee, O God, the waters saw thee; they were afraid; the depths also were troubled, the clouds poured out water. * * * Thy way is in the sea and thy path in the great waters, and thy footsteps are not known. Thou leadest thy people like a flock by the hand of Moses and Aaron." This settles the Red Sea baptism. Moses says it was on dry ground. David says it was a pouring, and while it was done before the giving of the law, Paul says it was for our example, and of course they modeled after the example set by the law giver, for God must be consistent with himself, but could not be if he set an example by immersion and commanded another by sprinkling and pouring. This makes God contradict himself which he cannot do. Now, Brother Immersionist, will you be good and follow the example as set by God, which Paul says was done for our example? You see David says it was done by pouring.

W. Well, well; you say this is the first baptism known in the Bible. I thought you relied upon the 44th chapter of Isaiah, where God says, "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty and floods upon the dry ground." Of course this is only a rain, and

now you think it rained on the children of Israel while they were in the sea, and this constituted the baptism. Do you think it never rained before that time? I have heard that it did not rain before the flood, but I never heard that it never rained until the Red Sea incident. But to your reference in Psalms 77. Do you know that only one cloud accompanied the children of Israel in that journey. But David says the "clouds" (plural) poured out "water." So you see David talks of a different occasion and of different clouds. Besides, don't you know that the cloud with the camp of Israel was a "pillar of fire by night?" See Ex. 13:21. Now read Ex. 14th chapter and you will find that they crossed the sea in the night. Do you suppose it rained water out of that cloud of fire that night? Pshaw! Your claim is too ridiculous to think about. Now read Psalms 68:7-9, and you will find what David referred to in the 77th Psalm when he said, "The clouds poured out water. Hear it:

"O God, when thou wentest forth before thy people, when thou didst march through the wilderness; Selah:

The earth shook, the heavens also dropped at the presence of God: even Sinai itself was moved at the presence of God, the God of Israel.

Thou, O God, didst send a plentiful rain, whereby thou didst confirm thine inheritance, when it was weary.

It all happened when there came a rain at Sinai.

Now, my friend, do not only be good, but have some sense, and never say again, that when David said the clouds poured out water he referred to the crossing of the Red Sea, and that this was how Israel was baptized. But do you ask me to show why this incident was called a baptism? I will do it.

Paul says (1 Cor. 10:2), "They were all baptized unto Moses, in the cloud, and in the sea." You will note the fact that the sea had as much to do with their baptism as the cloud did. The waters of the sea were divided until they formed a wall on their right hand and on their left. The cloud that was before them came over and behind them, thus burying them entirely, and in this way separating them from the Egyptians, and when they emerged out of the sea and from under the cloud, having been buried, they were resurrected. So Paul calls it a baptism, and you know Paul says that baptism is a burial and a resurrection. Col. 2:12.

The Israelites were overwhelmed; they were completely covered, hidden or buried out of sight, and when they came out it was called a baptism, and so it was, but not a pouring as you say.

Not one drop of water fell on them in that passage.

So fare you well, Bro. Watkins, till we meet again.

CHAPTER VI.

Places of Baptism Continued.

B. In the first place the Bible nowhere says Christ went **into** the water, nor does it say he was immersed. Of course we admit that **eis** sometimes means into, but that is by no means its most frequent use, and then it never means to immerse, and if you can infer that it means to immerse, I can infer that it means they were sprinkled. Now, the word has twenty-two meanings; that is, the Greek word **eis**, and in many cases it cannot mean anything akin to immersion. For instance, in Matt. 2:12: "They departed into their own country." 20th verse: "Arise and go into the land of Israel." Matt. 27:30: "And they spit upon him and they took the reed and smote him on the head." John 7:4; "Many of the rulers believe on him?" Here to spit on, to smite on the head, to believe on, could hardly be made cases of immersion. I might cite many others where the idea of immersion is impossible, but these are sufficient to show that into cannot be relied on to even infer immersion, much less to prove it. In the New Testament the word is translated fifty-five times to mean, on; twenty-four times to mean, upon; about four hundred times to mean, to; and eighty one times, for, with various other meanings. So **eis** is a very slippery word for an immersionist to walk upon, and a poor foundation to stake one's cause on.

W. Of course no one but a fool would say that the passages you quote mean immersion, or refer to baptism in any way, and nobody but a silly simpleton would use them as denying immersion. No one says **eis**, the primary meaning of which is into, always means immersion, but every one knows that when Philip took the Eunuch down into the water (Acts 8:38) he did not sprinkle him, but that he went down into the water to do that which could not be performed without going into the water. So any one can see that the Eunuch was baptized (immersed), and not sprinkled.

B. Yes, I see it says they went into the water, but you did not find where it said he immersed him.

Then you say it was not under the law, as in the Old Testament scriptures. Let us see about that. This took place only one year after the crucifixion of Christ, A. D. 34; and not one word of the New Testament was written for years after this. Then, too, the Eunuch was reading the prophecy of Isaiah. In verse 31 the Eunuch "desired Philip that he would come up and sit with him." Then in verse 38; they went down off the chariot to the water, or into it, as it is rendered. But who went in to the water? The

Book says "both Phillip and the Eunuch." Now if "into" proves immersion, it proves Philip was immersed as well as the Eunuch, for he went just where the Eunuch did. Both went into the water. But, brother, this is one of the affusionists' strongest points. The Eunuch was reading the prophet Isaiah, the very book which says, Christ, when he came, should pour and sprinkle the water. And the place where the Eunuch was reading was right where Isaiah said, "So shall he sprinkle many nations." Is. 52:15, and Act 8:35. It says, "And Philip began at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus." Then, brother, Jesus must have sprinkled, and Philip, following Christ's command to "baptize all nations," must have sprinkled the Eunuch. You admit the scripture that the Eunuch was reading was Isaiah, and that not one verse of the New Testament was written at that time; and that the gospel had not been opened to the Gentiles. You must also admit that no New Testament writer ever quoted from another New Testament writer; but always, the apostles and Christ quoted from the old testament. So the only book the Eunuch had to get his idea of baptism from was the Old Testament; and at this very time he was reading that part which says (Is. 44:3): "For I will pour water on him that is thirsty." And in Is. 52:15: "So shall he sprinkle many nations." So the Eunuch got his idea of baptism from the book he was reading; and like every other part of the Bible, where the mode is referred to, it says sprinkle and pour.

W. Luke expressly states, that the place of the scripture which the Eunuch was reading is that found in the 53d chapter and not in the 52d, and besides, if the Eunuch had read the entire book of Isaiah he would never have learned one thing about baptism as a religious ordinance, for such doctrine concerning the word is not in the entire book. I have already shown you that the passage in Isa. 44 means a rain and not baptism, and that the word for sprinkle in Isa. 52:15 means to startle, to surprise and not to sprinkle or even to baptize in any way. The Eunuch got his idea of Baptism from Philip's preaching, not from Isaiah, nor from the Old Testament anywhere. And Philip preached unto him Jesus, not Moses, and the law. I advise that you do. You will find it in Acts the 8th chapter. It would be well for you to read that chapter. Are you sick of this case? Then try the Pentecost baptism.

B. Certainly, all scholars admit that Baptizo means to immerse. And we know, too, that no honest scholar will deny that it means to sprinkle and to pour, just as much as it means to immerse, and the man that denies this is perversely mean or inexcusably ignorant. But, brother, do you remember that these Jews,

apostles and all were keeping Pentecost a feast of the Mosaic law, and that none but a Jew ceremonially clean dared to keep the feast of Pentecost? And don't you know that these apostles who baptized the people on that day kept the law for thirty years after in regard to these feasts and washings; and that no Gentile dared to partake of these services, unless he first became a Jew? So, my brother, all the services of Pentecost were transacted according to the law, and in fulfillment of the prophecies. The law demanded and the prophets foretold that the Christian baptism should be performed by sprinkling and pouring.

But laying these inferential arguments aside, and they are all you immersionists have, let us come directly to the word of God. We have a prophecy referring to Pentecost, and there we find it literally fulfilled. We will give it to you in parallel columns:

OLD TESTAMENT

Ezekiel 36:24, "For I will gather you out of all countries and bring you into your own land."

A more literal fulfillment can not be found in Holy Writ. There were Jews out of every nation under heaven, then at Jerusalem, just as Ezekiel said there would be. Now let us examine the next prophecy:

OLD TESTAMENT

2 Ezek. 36:25, "Then I will sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean from all your filthiness * * * will I cleanse you."

NEW TESTAMENT

Acts 2:5, "And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven."

NEW TESTAMENT

Acts 2:38, "Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

Here we have the baptism foretold, and how it was to be performed. In Acts 2:38 they were commanded to be baptized, but when? When they had been gathered out of all countries into their own land, and it was fulfilled at Pentecost. So we have two of Ezekiel's prophecies fulfilled. Now let us try the third:

OLD TESTAMENT

8. Ezek. 36:26, "A new heart will I give you. * * * and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh."

NEW TESTAMENT

Acts 15:8-9, "And God which knoweth the hearts beareth them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith."

Peter is here describing the conversion of Cornelius and his household, and says God puts no difference between him and his household, and the Jews. So the Jews had their hearts purified on Pentecost by faith; hence God gave them another, or a clean heart that day. Another fulfillment of Ezekiel. We will next notice the fulfillment of his prophecy of the Holy Spirit:

OLD TESTAMENT

4. Ezek. 36:27, "And I will put my spirit within you."

NEW TESTAMENT

Acts 2:4, "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost."

Here are four prophecies of Ezekiel as he looked down the line of

the future, and told what should come to pass. And in Acts 2:38 we find every prophecy literally fulfilled.

W. It is not only a fact that all scholars say that Baptizo means to immerse, but all real scholars say that as to the act itself, it does not mean anything else. Not one lexicographer has ever defined it to mean sprinkle or pour, only those who are perversely ignorant, ever think of such a foolish thing. I know this, I know also that the apostles were not in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, in answer to Jewish law or custom. They were there in obedience to the Savior's instruction when he told them to "tarry in Jerusalem until they were endued with power from on high."

I know also, that the apostles did not observe Jewish laws and customs after Pentecost. Paul as a Nazarite kept his vow, and that was all. The law was nailed to the cross, and after that the people were under a new dispensation.

I know also that neither the law nor any prophet ever said that baptism in the Christian age or in any other age should, or even could, be performed by sprinkling or pouring. They were too truthful to say such a false thing. I know also that you show much ignorance of the scriptures when you say that the language of Ezekiel in 36:24-25 was fulfilled at Pentecost, or at any time during the gospel age. That meeting of the Jews in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2) was nothing special; they had been there every year; they were there the year before, and for many years past; but they always returned home after the ceremonies were over. The prophecy of Ezekiel had reference to bringing the Jews out of captivity from among the nations and countries whither they had been scattered. God promised to bring them back into their own land (Palestine), and when they were brought back into their own land they should be cleansed from idol worship. The Jews were not worshipping idols at the time they were in Jerusalem on the Pentecost of Acts 2nd but at the time of the fulfilling of the prophecy, Ezekiel said they would be. So it was not at Pentecost, nor thereabout. If you will read the books of Ezra, Nehemiah and Haggai, you will find what Ezek. 36:24-5 means. In the days of Zerubbabel, governor of Judah, in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, the Jews were brought into their own land, the temple was rebuilt, and their old order of worship again established. Then it was that the water of purification, clean water, described in the 19th chapter of Numbers, was again used and sprinkled on the people, but it had ashes of the red heifer in it. Water alone was never sprinkled on anybody for any purpose. This was just fifty-eight years after Ezekiel wrote the prophesy, but it was not a baptism or anything like it. Strange, you can not learn some things.

B. Now, brother, let us examine Paul's baptism, Acts 9:17. This, as you know, was performed in the house of Judas, and Paul was standing upon his feet. For this is the meaning of the Greek word Anastas, here rendered, "he arose and was baptized;" and there can be no immersion in that case.

Our next case is that of Cornelius. Acts 10:47: "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Here they were all in the house where Peter preached, where they believed, where the Holy Ghost came upon them, and where they were all baptized, not immersed. There was no place for immersion, and Peter was preaching from the prophets, because they had no other book of the Bible but the law and the prophets, and they taught sprinkling and pouring.

The next case is that of Lydia, Acts 16:13-15. There you immersionists try to make it appear that Paul and Silas went out to the river to immerse people; but the Bible says they went out there "where prayer was wont to be made, and we sat down and spake to the women which resorted thither." Nothing here, only they were near a river to hold a prayer meeting, and Lydia was baptized. Not a word said of her or Paul going to the river, much less of being immersed.

Take Acts 16:19-34. In this beautiful narrative we find Paul and Silas cast into the inner prison. There the jailer begged to know what he must do to be saved, when he had brought them out into the outer prison. There Paul preached unto him and to all his house. There he took (or received them, as the Greek word means) "them the same hour of the night, and was baptized, he and all his straightway." Straightway means at once immediately, without loss of time. There surely was no baptistry in that heathen jail, where they had just whipped Paul and Silas for preaching Christ. The river was outside of the city, see verse 13, so it was not convenient for them to be immersed in that river. And, too, if Paul and Silas went out of that jail at midnight and went off to some tank, pond or river, and immersed the jailer and his family, he acted the hypocrite the next morning. For when the authorities sent word to the keeper to let them go, Paul sent word back: "They have beaten us openly, uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison; and now do they thrust us out privily? Nay, verily, but let them come themselves and fetch us out." Now, sir, do you believe Paul and Silas acted such hypocrites as to go out at midnight, under the cover of darkness, and then refuse the next morning to leave the jail in daylight, unless the magistrates came down and let them out? Such duplicity is unthinkable of those men of God. No, sir; they baptized the jailer

and his family right in that jail, by the only Bible mode of baptism, that is practicable in every place and under all circumstances, and that is not by immersion.

Now, brother, we have gone through the places of baptism, and have shown that from the book they read, from the law they were under, from the most of the places, that there is absolutely no ground for immersion. You can not get it either from a fair translation or just interpretation. It is not there. God's word does not teach it, but does teach affusion and no other mode.

W. Who told you that Paul was baptized standing up in the house of Judas? and that *Anastas* (arise) means to stand up where you are? If your wife should tell you while you were yet in bed to *arise*, dress yourself and eat your breakfast, would you **stand up in the bed**, put on your trousers and boots while standing up in the bed, and then stand there and eat your breakfast? I guess you would. 'Twould be about like you to do so, but a sensible man would get out of bed, dress himself, go into the dining room and eat his breakfast, like other folks. When Christ said to the imponent man, "Arise (*anastas*) take up your bed and walk," do you suppose the man tried to stand still not move out of his place, and walk? Why would Ananias have Saul arise at all, if he was only going to sprinkle water on him, He could do that better while Saul was yet kneeling. After all, it is certain that Saul went to where he could find enough water to be buried in, and arise out of, for he says that when he was baptized he was buried and raised again. See Col. 2:12. So everybody knows that Paul was immersed, and not sprinkled. It seems to me that even a Methodist preacher ought to see that.

The next is Cornelius in Acts 10. There is not an intimation in the entire chapter that the baptism of Cornelius occurred in the house. This no one knows better than yourself. But in any case they were buried when they were baptized, and this was not a sprinkling, but an immersion. See Rom. 6:1-4.

Next is Lydia's case in Acts 16. It is said that the meeting which Lydia attended, and where Paul preached, was down by the river. It is not stated that she was sprinkled or poured, but that she was baptized—buried and resurrected. In baptism the body is washed. See Heb. 10:22. This requires an immersion. So Lydia was baptized (immersed), not sprinkled. Do you want to try another case?

Now, when I have exposed you on the jailer's baptism, which I will do, I suppose you will quit the places of baptism and try something else. First, I will say that when Paul sent word to the rulers that he did not wish to go out of the jail privately, but publicly, just as they went in, he referred to his being finally

released, and not simply going out of the jail under the direction of the jailer—a thing always permissible. So you slander Paul unjustly. Paul and Silas were not hypocrites. It is stated emphatically that they went out of the jail that night, and went into the jailer's house. Read it and see:

29. "Then he called for a light and sprang in, and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas.

30. And brought them out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved?

31. And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.

32. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house.

33. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway.

34. And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house."

Now, note the facts: First, the jailer brought them out of the prison, and second, Paul preached to all that were in his house. So the preaching was done in the jailer's house, and not in the prison. Then after the preaching the jailer took Paul and Silas, washed their stripes and was baptized, then after he was baptized he "brought them into the house," where he set meat before them, showing clearly that he went out of the house to be baptized, which of course he would not have done to have only a little water sprinkled in his face, or on his head. Thus the jailer, like all the rest, was baptized, immersed, that is he was buried and resurrected when he was baptized. See Col. 2:12: "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead."

In going over the places of baptism, you have not found one case that even points at an allusion toward the possible probability of sprinkling or pouring; but in every case baptism or immersion is positively taught; and now in the very last of your concluding remarks, you convict yourself with being what I should not like to be called. You have, and do sometimes, immerse people and when you do you claim to do it by the authority of God.

In one of the talks I have had with you, you said, "Anything done in the name of Christ means by his authority." But now you say God does not authorize immersion, your words are, "God's

word does not teach it, but it teaches affusion and no other mode."

Now, sir, when you stand in the water, with your hand raised, and say to the candidate, "**By the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ I baptize you,**" and then immerse that candidate, thinking at the same time that God nowhere authorizes it, what do you tell, and what are you anyway? Poor man, I am sorry for you; but you ought to leave your human practices and come to the truth.

CHAPTER VII.

The Bible Meaning of Baptism.

B. Well, Brother Immersionist, in our preceding talks we have carefully examined the meanings of the word *Baptizo*, baptism and baptize, and found that from the words themselves neither side can prove their mode of baptism. For that it means to pour, to sprinkle, and to immerse, when abstractly used, no honest scholar will deny. So, then, to get the true meaning of the word, we must look to the connection in which it stands, and the purpose for which it was used. For instance, we take the word travel. I say, "I travel to town." From this generic word no one knows how I travel, but I put some other qualifying word or words with it, and we then learn how I travel. Not long since I traveled to an appointment, a distance of seventy-five miles, and I used six modes of travel. I rode in a carriage, in a train, walked, rode in a street car, then in a buggy, and wound up with a horseback ride. Yet, it was all traveling; but you can not tell by what mode until I use some qualifying words. So it is with the word baptize, or *Baptizo*. Neither can be relied on to give any specific mode; but other words must be used to tell the mode employed, and this must be determined by the connection in which it stands, and the purpose for which it was used in the Bible. Then let us begin with the New Testament; and I shall only refer to the Greek to show in what connection *Baptizo* is used. We will begin with Matt. 3:11: "I indeed baptize (*Baptizo*) you with water unto repentance;***he shall baptize (*Baptizo*) you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Here you see that *Baptizo*, or baptize, is used in reference to the baptism of water, and of the Holy Ghost, too; the same words "with water," and "with the Holy Ghost," modifying the word baptize. So they were used to express the mode in either case. Now let us read Acts 1:5: "For John truly baptized (*Baptizo*) with water, but ye shall be baptized (*Baptizo*) with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Here Christ used the same words in reference to water baptism that he did to Holy Ghost baptism, and in both cases it was **with water, with the spirit, and not immerse**, as the Baptists and Campbellites have in their trans-

lations of the New Testament, which are glaring violations of the rules of translation.

W. The very opposite of what you say is true. We have found that baptism is from the word *Baptizo* in the Greek, a word which means to dip, plunge or immerse; that sprinkle is a translation of another word (*Rhaino*), which is no way related to baptism, and that pour is from *Cheo* in the Greek, and that it no more means to baptize than any other word you might imagine or even coin yourself. Sprinkle or pour no more mean modes, or a mode of baptism, than to sneeze is a mode of baptism. Your illustration is childish and silly; the mode of baptism is in the word itself. It is a specific word, the meaning is the mode or the action itself. If you travel you move from one point to another; you can not travel without doing this, for to move from one place to another is the meaning of the word and is actually in the word. So with *Baptizo* (baptize) the word means to dip, to immerse, the meaning is in the word itself. So you can't have a baptism without immersion. In the New Testament it is called a burial and a resurrection. This is not true of either sprinkling or pouring, so neither of these is baptism. No, sir; any word of which you may think, to laugh, to cry, to weep, to play, to grunt, to sigh, or just anything, comes as nearly meaning to baptize as do sprinkle or pour. Neither of these words is any akin to baptism. As Prof. Anthon says "sprinkling and pouring are entirely out of the question." **Baptizo means immerse.**

The word baptize does not need a qualifying term to explain its meaning whether the phrase baptize with (in) water, or baptize with (in) the Holy Ghost. It means immersion in both cases, the definition itself being in the word itself. We have already seen that in is the correct rendering of the Greek particle en not with, but even **with water** does not suggest affusion. The smith cools his iron with water by dipping, immersing, baptizing it.

B. Yes, you are right for once. If we can find what the words "baptize with the Holy Ghost" mean, we shall then know what "Baptize with water" means. Then let us read the following scriptures, Acts 1:8: "But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you." There it is, "come upon you." Baptize with, not in. Now, Acts 1:5 is a prophecy to be fulfilled in a few days, "not many days hence." Let us see how the baptism of this prophecy was fulfilled. Acts 2:1-18 tells where and how it was done. Jerusalem was the place. "But tarry ye at Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high." Luke 24:49. Now, how was it fulfilled? Read Acts 2:16-17: "But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel, "and it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my spirit upon all flesh."

verse 18: "And on my servants, and on my handmaidens, I will pour out in those days of my spirit, and they shall prophesy." There, see it? Look brother. "Pour out," "Come upon," are not good cases of immersion, are they, brother?

W. It is a fact that the Holy Ghost which came on the day of Pentecost was the baptismal form of it. It is a fact that the Holy Ghost was poured out. The water was poured out into a pool, and I was baptized in that pool. I have poured water into a baptistery many times, and then baptized in the baptistery, but the pouring of water was one thing and the act of baptizing quite a different thing. So in this case. They were baptized with (in) the spirit when it filled all the house where they were sitting, hence immersed in the Holy Ghost.

B. Brother, where do you say that scripture is? Let me have chapter and verse again. I have it now, and I will read it for you. "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a mighty rushing wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting." Now brother, what filled the house, the spirit or the sound? You immersionists are always putting the cart before the horse, and taking sound for sense. And here you try to put a personal spirit for the sound of the wind.

W. That which filled the house is that which sat upon them. "And it sat upon each of them." See verse 3. And you think it was the **sound** that sat upon them, do you? Pshaw! But again, that which filled the house and sat upon them was the very thing that they were filled with, and you think this was sound, do you? So you are the man who tries to fill the people with sound instead of sense. You ought to feel ashamed for so degrading the words of sacred truth. Of course it was the Holy Ghost that filled the house and filled the apostles. Hence, they were immersed in it. Your man, Dr. Ditzler, himself says they were But you have other ridiculous things to say about Holy Ghost baptism. So we will hear you further.

B. Acts 10:44: "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on them which heard the word." Does "shed forth" and "fall on" sound like being "buried in the liquid grave," Brother Immersionist?

W. No, it doesn't sound like there was any grave, in which to be buried.

B. But read Acts 10:47: "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" "Receive," "baptize" is not immerse, but once more. Acts 11:15-17. Peter concluded his arguments that the Gentiles

should receive the gospel with these words: "And as I began to speak the Holy Ghost **fell on** them, as on us at the beginning; then remembered I the word of the Lord, how he said, "John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." In these two scriptures Peter plainly calls "fell on" baptism. Now, brother, if Peter calls it "fell on," "shed forth," "pour out," "received," and Christ called it "come upon," "endued with power from on high," why will you immersionists persist in calling it immersion, when Christ, Peter and Paul called it by words meaning affusion? But you immersionists contradict the Bible and yourselves in your version of the New Testament. I will give you samples of your contradictions. Let us read Acts 1:5 out of the Baptist Testament: "For John indeed immersed with water, but ye shall be immersed in the Holy Spirit not many days hence." Now, compare these translations with Acts 1-8: "But ye shall receive power when the Holy Ghost is come upon you." Here the Baptists admit by their own version, and they say it is the best translation ever made, that the baptism of the spirit was performed by its "coming upon" the disciples. But read further from this simon pure translation of the Baptists. Acts 2:17: "And it will be in the last days saith God, that I will pour out of my spirit upon all flesh." Verse 33: "And having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this which ye both see and hear." In Acts 10:44: "While Peter was yet speaking these words the Holy Spirit **fell on** all who heard the word." Once more. Acts 11:15-16: "And as I began to speak the Holy Spirit fell on them, as also on us at the beginning, and I remembered the word of the Lord, how he said, John immersed **with water**, but ye shall be immersed **in the Holy Spirit**." Now you may search all books, and you will not find a more palpable self-contradiction, nor a more direct contradiction of God's words than is here presented. They write the spirit was poured out, came upon, fell on, and then called it immersion. Such translation is pitiable. But let us see if the Campbellites have any better translation. In Acts 1:5: "John indeed immersed in water, but we shall be immersed in the Holy Spirit within a few days." Now read the 8th verse: "But you shall receive power by the Holy Spirit coming upon you." Here they call it immerse, and yet say it is done by coming upon. Acts 2:17-18: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God. I will pour out a portion of my spirit upon all flesh. * Yes, in those days I will pour out of my spirit upon my servants and upon my handmaids." Verse 33: "And having received the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father, he has shed forth this which you see and hear." Is there any ground for the doctrine of immersion in the spirit, or **baptize in it**, when it says **come upon, pour**

out, shed forth? I can't see it. But let us try one more case of this self-contradiction. Acts 11:15-16: "And as I began to speak, the Holy Spirit **fell on them**, even as **upon** us at the beginning and I remembered the words of the Lord, how he said, "John immersed in water, but you shall be immersed in the Holy Spirit." Now, Brother Immersionist, how do these inconsistencies sound, from the **said to be** best translation in the world? Saying in one breath that it was performed by **falling on, shedding forth, pouring out, coming upon, receiving**, and yet in the next breath to save a pet theory, calling such actions **immersion**? Such translations, if they were not pitiable, would be contemptible. But to such must all immersionists resort, if they would save a sinking cause. God pity and save them. There the fulfillment of John's and Christ's prophecies are said by Peter, Christ, the Baptists and Campbellites to be by **pouring out, shedding forth and coming upon**; and yet so prejudiced to their theory, the immersionists call it immersion. Such perversions of truth and Holy Writ are lamentable. Christ and John called it baptism; Peter says it was pouring, but some would-be theologians say it was by immersion. Now, Brother Immersionist, what do you say? Will you be good, and read God's word and not make big assertions without proof, for doctrines?

W. Well, I reckon you thought you would save your best for your last, and yet by sensible people it will be considered the weakest, and by far the most ridiculous things you have said in all our talks on baptism.

Your Bible definition of the word Baptizo is too **ridiculous** for any thing except to adorn the pages of a comic almanac, and you are not honest enough to complete the definition at that.

The Holy Ghost was not only said to have been shed forth, poured out, fell on, and come upon; it also sat upon them. Acts 2:3. Why did you not put that in, too, and say that the word also means to sit on? With this we have the definition complete. The word baptize means to pour out, to shed forth, to come upon, to fall on and sit upon. It is a well known rule in logic which says the definition of a word may be put for the word itself without destroying the sense. Now let us read Matt. 3:5-6. "Then went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan confessing their sins." See also Mark 1:1. We ask, What did John do to those people in the river of Jordan? Why he baptized them. That is to say, John poured out the people in the river of Jordan; John shed them forth in the river of Jordan; John came

upon the people in the river of Jordan; John fell upon the people in the river of Jordan; and John actually sat upon each of them in the river of Jordan! How ridiculous! If that be the meaning of baptize, there are some men whom I should not like to have baptize me; they weigh too much. I should not want them to sit down on me in the middle of a river.

Now, my friend, you see how ridiculous is your strongest and best argument. Indeed it is not even respectable nonsense.

As I have already shown you, the pouring out, shedding forth, etc., was not the baptism, nor any part of it; the baptism came after this and was an immersion. Hear Dr. Ditzler on this subject.

"The Greek **Pontizo, enduna buthizo, Kataduno**, all mean definitely to immerse." See Graves-Ditzler debate, page 171.

Now one form of the word enduno, which Dr. Ditzler says "means **definitely** to immerse," is translated endued in Luke 24:49, where Jesus promises the apostles the baptism of the Holy Ghost. "Ye shall be endued with power from on high," and this, says the doctor, means to immerse; then they were to be immersed with the power or with the Holy Ghost.

Now, my friend be good and have some sense, and never say again that the baptism of the Holy Ghost was done by pouring. It is not the truth, but it is as false as anything the devil ever told. Sprinkling and pouring was not even dreamed of until about 250 A. D. Immersion was the universal practice before that time.

B. Who told you all the first Christians immersed? The first Christians did not immerse at all. You cannot find a single case of immersion by a single dip for twelve hundred years after Christ. The first to practice a partial dipping by the single dip were the Euonians, and they dipped head downward. This was done in A. D. 380. All the rest of the entire immersions, for twelve hundred years after Christ, were three dips and many of the candidates were entirely nude when baptized. Nor did these superstitious notions come into practice until Tertullian's day, A. D. 170-250; and he believed water baptism saved the subject whether infant or adult; and that all sins committed after baptism were unpardonable. Hence we find immersion the mother of a large brood of heresies. Not the mother of all heresies but she has a large brood of them. This prolific mother, herself, was born about A. D. 200, from the superstitious brain of Tertullian, who believed in Trine immersion, and a number of other heresies, as the signing of the cross, blessing of the water and stripping the subject naked, in order, as he said, that "the water might touch

every part of the body, lest any part remaining untouched, sin might cleave thereto." Thus was immersion born, and wrapped in superstitious swaddling clothes. For Tertullian was the first writer of any note, who advocated the doctrine of immersion; and he was a full-fledged trine immersionist; and he, with Basil, admitted there was no foundation in scripture for their practice. Having noticed the birth and nature of the mother, we will now notice her offspring with their birth and vagaries.

The first child, from this coalition of a backslidden church, and a superstitious reverence for a church ordinance, was Baptismal Regeneration, or salvation by water. Born about A. D. 200-250. This is the legitimate result of taking the sign for the thing signified; the material, instead of the spiritual, hence Tertullian, with his followers, plunged headlong into the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, with all its follies; such as those who die unbaptized are lost and those who sin after baptism are consigned to perdition. Thus from Tertullian's watery brain, sprang this water Goddess, at whose altar many worship today.

W. Yes; I see you are as ignorant of post apostolic history as you are of the scriptures you seem to know nothing of either; everyone knows that the first person to have water sprinkled on him for baptism was Novation, A. D. 251, who thought he was going to die, being sick in bed, had water sprinkled on himself all over; and your own Dr. Wall says he was denied any position in the church, because he had not been baptized. your statement to the effect that immersion did not come into use until Tertullian's day shows how little you know about it. Both Barnabas and Hermas, to each of whom Paul refers in his writing state positively that when persons were baptized they were immersed. Tertullian was indeed a trine immersionist, he said himself, however, that it was a "somewhat ampler pledge than the Lord had appointed in the gospel," showing that he knew that three dips were two too many; that the gospel did not authorize but one. Your attempt to slander the baptism (immersion), which our Lord walked over seventy miles to receive at the hand of John in the river of Jordan, betrays the corruption that is within your heart, and your hatred for God's word. "Nude baptisms" may have been performed sometimes, but they were very painstaking to have order and decency obtain in such cases. There were also "nude" sprinklings in those times, the candidate was placed in a large bowl where the body was largely hidden from view, but of course you would not tell things of this kind.

Now, sir, in conclusion, I wish to say that all scholars and all history agree in the fact that Baptizo does not mean to sprinkle

and pour, but always to immerse, dip or plunge; that immersion was the almost universal practice of the church for thirteen hundred years, sprinkling and pouring being substituted for baptism only in cases of sickness, called "clinic baptisms." To this statement of facts there is no exception among scholars. And now let me advise you to get a Bible and read it; get some books and study them. If the talks I have had with you show a fair sample of your knowledge (and I suppose they do), you have not yet learned the alphabet of the Bible, and you do not know enough to even touch the hem of the garment on the meaning of words or of facts in history. In the meantime, if you like, I will be glad to help you in your study. I will gladly give you further lessons, as you may be able to receive them; I have given you the primmer lessons. I have tried not to burden you with advanced thoughts, for "hitherto you have not been able to bear it, neither yet now are you able." So try to digest what I have given you. When you have done this well, if afterward, you may have a convenient season, call for me. Good-bye.

CHAPTER VIII

Scriptural Baptism.

Thus far in this booklet, in replying to Mr. Ballard, I have, of course, been confined to the matter that he brought forward, and since he knew what he could twist and misrepresent on the immersionist's side, he mentioned only such matters as he felt could be so used.

In my reply I have confined myself to the limits of his own field. For this reason, in justice to myself, to the truth, and for the information of all readers, I will write two short chapters and bring out some facts not easily used in a dialogue.

First, I wish to ask the reader the following question: If while standing on a street corner in your town, or by the roadside near your home, you should see many people of the city and of the region roundabout, all going in the same direction, and upon inquiry you should find that they were going out to a river to a baptizing, what would be your impression with reference to how that baptizing would be done? Would you think of the Methodists and of sprinkling and pouring? Of course you would not. But you would know at once that those people were immersionists of some kind, and you would say they are going to the river to be immersed. Well, this is just what is said of the people whom John baptized. See Mark 1:4-5:

"John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.

And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins."

If you would know upon seeing people go out to a river for baptism today that immersion was the thing intended, of course you understand that the people whom John baptized were immersed; so this settles the matter of what was done in this case. The people were immersed, of course.

One of the presidents of the United States, when sixteen years of age, was hired to a neighbor to dig potatoes. The potatoes were carried in a basket, and put in a cellar near by. Two parties who sat in the yard watching the boy at his work discussed the action of baptism. One said: "I do not believe that immersion is essential to the act; I think one drop is as good as an ocean." The young potato digger heard the remark and, turning to the gentleman who made it, said: "Sir, the book teaches that in baptism the body is washed; can you tell me how you can wash the body with one drop of water?" This suggestion caused silence, for the conversation continued no further. Of course the boy knew, as all can see, that if the body be washed in baptism nothing short of immersion will meet the demands.

Now this is just what is required; in Hebrews 10:22 you will find the passage: "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."

Again in 1. Pet. 3:21, speaking of baptism, Peter says, 'tis not to put away the filth of the flesh. This expression suggests the probability of some one thinking that baptism was for the putting away of the filth (dirt) of the flesh or body, but who would even imagine such a thing as being the purpose of an act, in which only a little water is sprinkled in the face or on the head?

Reader, would you think such a thing of sprinkling or pouring? But any one might so construe an immersion. This of itself shows clearly that Peter had only immersion in his mind when he spoke of baptism.

It was so easy for the Jews who had been in the habit of bathing the flesh, the whole body, that it might be clean, to mistake the purpose of baptism, an institution in which the whole body is washed, and think the purpose of it was to cleanse the flesh from filth. Hence, Peter's statement to the contrary.

I wish next, to call the reader's attention to the elements of a Bible baptism. Please read with Bible in hand and verify each

passage of scripture referred to. Let us try sprinkling pouring and immersion, by the divine standard, and see which, if either will fit.

There are at least nine elements of a Bible baptism, as far as the action of it is concerned.

They are as follows:

1. An Administrator. Matt. 3:6.
2. A Subject. Mark 1:5.
3. Water. Matt. 3:11.
4. Much Water. John 3:23.
5. Coming to Water. Acts 8:36.
6. Going Down into Water. Acts 8:38.
7. A Burial. Rom. 6:1-4.
8. A Resurrection. Col. 2:12.
9. Coming up out of the water. Acts 8:39.

Now I ask, How many of the above elements are present in sprinkling or pouring? Let us see.

To sprinkle or pour water on one for baptism you have an administrator; you have a subject, and you have water. But you do not have much water; you do not go to the water, you do not go down into the water, you do not bury the subject, you do not resurrect the candidate, and you do not come up out of the water. So the best that we can say for sprinkling and pouring is, that they possess no more than one-third of the elements of a Bible baptism, and that two-thirds of the truth is found wanting

Shall we try immersion by this rule? All right:

1. To immerse you must have an administrator.
2. You must have a subject.
3. You must have water.
4. You must have much water.
5. You must go to the water.
6. You go down into the water.
7. You bury the subject.
8. You resurrect the candidate.
9. You then come up out of the water.

So immersion has all the elements of a Bible baptism, and no more. Therefore immersion, and immersion only, is Bible baptism.

Reader, did you ever stop to think how few, even of the affusionist preachers, have been sprinkled for baptism? They will

ask you to put up with it, but they themselves could be satisfied with nothing but immersion.

Dr. Talmage, D. L. Moody, Sam Jones and all such men were immersed. George Washington, our first president, was immersed. You would be surprised to know how many of the great men in the affusionist churches who would not be satisfied with anything but immersion for baptism, and how few even of the smaller class who have been sprinkled and not immersed. You have perhaps never known or even heard of a person who had been immersed and afterward became dissatisfied with this baptism and sought sprinkling or pouring. But you have known of scores—yea, thousands—who were immersed after having been sprinkled or poured. While such evidence is not conclusive, it serves to show where the preponderance of the evidence is. All of which, taken together, proves positively that baptism is immersion, and that only.

I wish next to give some authority on the question of whether there be a standard Greek-English lexicon which gives to the Greek word *Baptizo* the meaning of to sprinkle or pour. Many testimonials on the question have been published and all competent men say that there is no such a book known to the reading world. But added to evidence already submitted, I shall here give "**verbatim**" some recent letters from university professors in reply to a letter written by an honest inquirer.

The following is the letter:

Lane, Texas, July 9th, 1903.

Dear Sirs:

Please give me the name of a standard Greek lexicon which defines the word *Baptizo* to mean sprinkle or pour. Thanking you in advance for this information, I am yours truly,

J. W. PINKSTON.

following are the answers:

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

J. G. Hart, Secretary.

5 University Hall, Harvard University

Cambridge, Mass., July 13, 1903.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of July 9th, addressed to the President of the University, has been referred to me. I have consulted the Associate Professor of Greek and Latin, and he tells me that you will find a very good discussion of the Greek word "*Baptizo*" in Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon*, 7th edition.

Very truly yours,

J. G. HART.

YALE UNIVERSITY,

Secretary's Office.

New Haven, Conn., July 13, 1903.

Mrs. J. W. Pinkston, Lane, Texas.

My Dear Sir: Your note of July 9th, addressed to the president of Yale College, has been opened by me during his absence on a European trip. The meaning of the Greek word translated baptized in the New Testament may be secured by consulting any Greek Lexicon. Thayer's Lexicon of New Testament Greek is considered an authority. I do not care to enter into any discussion as to whether or not it carries with it the idea only of immersion.

Very truly yours,

ANSON PHELPS STOKES,
Secretary.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

Austin, Texas.

Office of the
University of Texas Record.

Mr. J. W. Pinkston, Lane, Texas.

Dear Sir: Your recent letter concerning the meaning of Baptizo, and addressed to the President of the University, has been referred to me for reply.

The most authentic and reliable Greek lexicon is that of Liddell & Scott. I copy below its entire article on the point in question:

BAPTIZO: To dip in or under water; figuratively used, as in the expression "bebaptismenoi," "soaked in wine;" bebaptismenos ophlemasiv, "head over heels in debt."

The standard dictionaries of the English language give the word "Baptism" as meaning "the application of water, either by pouring, by immersion, or by sprinkling." This, however, in my opinion is nothing more or less than a compromise between the creeds. I myself am interested in the problem as one of language-development. I should be glad to hear from you again, if you desire me to make any further investigation.

Yours truly,

HARRY P. STEGER,

Address: Harry P. Steger, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

W. E. Thompson, of Celeste, Texas wrote the same question to the Methodist Publishing House, Nashville, Tenn. The following is their reply:

Book Department
PUBLISHING HOUSE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH,
SOUTH.

Bigham & Smith, Agents,
Publishers Importers.

R. J. BIGHAM
D. M. SMITH

340, 342, 344, 346 Court Square
Nashville, Tenn., July 7, 1903.

W. E. Thompson, Celeste, Texas.

Dear Sir: Your favor of the 2d inst. is received, and in reply we regret to say that we do not know of any Greek Lexicon that gives the meaning of Baptizo as sprinkle or pour. We believe there were such lexicons published, but there are none in print that we are aware of.

Yours very truly,
BIGHAM & SMITH, Agents.

The original copies of the above letters are in my possession; any one who desires may have free privilege to examine them.

The occasion of the above letters was a challenge given by Bro. T. W. Philips, of Fort Worth, Texas, offering a reward of fifty dollars for such a book. This challenge was submitted by Bro. Phillips during his meeting in Celeste, Texas, in June of 1903. The challenge created some excitement, and resulted in a debate on baptism between Dr. E. W. Alderson, the leading scholar and debater in the Methodist church in Texas, and myself; but the book was not produced.

The Celeste debate was held in August, 1903. One month later the debate was repeated at Cumby, Texas, During the Cumby debate the same challenge was repeated, with the reward doubled, making an offer of one hundred dollars for a Greek-English lexicon which three professors of Greek in as many universities in America and Europe, would say was standard, that defined the word Baptizo to sprinkle or pour.

A note was written and signed by Walter A. Smith, Joe S. Warlick and others. A similar note of equal value, agreeing to pay to the widows and orphans of Cumby, in case such a book was not produced was shaken in the face of Dr. Alderson, asking him and his brethren to sign it, but they would not. And thus they permitted the debate to close, represented by a man whom the professor of Greek in the Methodist University of Texas, at Georgetown, says is their best man in the South, without his showing the book or offering to try to get it.

Of course the doctor's reason for refusing to make even one effort to produce such a book was that he knew there was no such

book in existence, for it is a fact that there is no such lexicon. Neither is there a scholar on earth that will translate the word Baptizo by either of the words to sprinkle or pour; but all testify that it means immerse.

In conclusion, I wish to ask, Which is the safe plan? To accept for baptism what no lexicon or translation says is a meaning of the word, or would you not prefer to have that which every scholar in the world says is baptism? If you prefer the latter, which is the only safe thing, you will not put up with affusion in any way, but, like the Savior, you will be baptized (immersed), and then "come up straightway out of the water." See Mark 1:9-11:

"And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan.

And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit like a dove descending upon him:

And there came a voice from heaven saying, Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

When you have done this you will have been baptized just as all the apostles taught and practiced; that is, you will have been buried and resurrected with your Lord and Master in baptism, and this, says Paul, is what it takes to constitute the baptism that he taught everywhere and to everybody. "**Buried with him in baptism wherein also ye are risen.**" Col. 2:12.

CHAPTER XI.

Patristic Evidence.

I think it not out of place to put in some extra matter in the way of authority from the history of baptism during the years immediately succeeding the time in which the apostles lived, also some admissions taken from the writings of Pedobaptist authors on the subject. The following quotations are taken largely from Mr. Pengilly's book on baptism. They have been verified and are absolutely correct:

Barnabas, Paul's companion. An epistle ascribed to him has escaped the ravages of time. Two passages refer to baptism; in one he says, "Blessed are they who, fixing their hope on the cross, have gone down into the water." The other, "We descend into the water.....and come up out of it.....having in our hearts reverential fear, and hope through Jesus. Epist. cap. xi.

Hermas, honored by Paul's salutation, Rom. xvi. 14. A Latin version of his work, entitled "The Pastor," or Shepherd, is extant.

In it he speaks of the apostles **accompanying** the persons to be baptized into the water. "The apostles and teachers preached to them that before were dead, and gave them this seal; for they went down with them into the water, and came up again." See this and other allusions in Lib. I. vis. 8, sect. 7; and Lib. III. similit—.

Justin Martyr, about A. D. 150, wrote "An Apology for Christians, addressed to the emperor, the senate, and people of Rome." In this work he describes the doctrines and ordinances of the church of Christ; and on baptism has the following passage: "I will now declare to you also, after what manner we, being made new by Christ, have dedicated ourselves to God, lest, if I should leave that out, I might seem to deal unfairly in some part of my apology. They who are persuaded and do believe that those things which are taught by us are true, and do promise to live according to them, are directed first to pray and ask of God with fasting, the forgiveness of their former sins; and we also pray and fast with them. Then we bring them to some place where there is water, and they are baptized by the same way of baptism by which we were baptized; for they are washed (en to hudati) in the water in the name of God the Father, Lord of all things; and of our Savior Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit." Justin Mart. Apolog., II. Sec. 79.

Tertullian (A. D. 204). For the law of baptizing is laid down, and the form prescribed: Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name, etc. He bound faith and the necessity of baptism together; therefore from that time all who believed were dipped." "The person to be baptized, in great simplicity.....is let down in the water and with a few words said, is dipped." Again, when speaking of the vain anxiety to be baptized in the Jordan—"There is no difference whether one is washed in a sea or in a pool, in a river or in a fountain, in a lake or in a channel; nor is there any difference between them whom John dipped in Jordan, and those whom Peter dipped in the Tiber:" *De Baptismo*, cap. 2, 4, 7, 13. See more in *De Corona Mil.* cap. I.

Gregory Nazianzen, A. D. 360. "We are buried with Christ by baptism that we may also rise again with Him; we descend with Him that we may also be lifted up with Him; we ascend with Him as we may also be glorified with Him." *Orat.* 40. *Stennett's Answer to Russen.*

Basil, A. D. 360. "In three immersions the great mystery of baptism is accomplished." *Stennett.*

Ambrose, A. D. 374. "Thou wast asked, Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty? Thou saidst, 'I do believe,' and wast

immersed, that is, thou was buried. Thou wast asked again, Dost thou believe on our Lord Jesus Christ and his crucifixion? Thou saidst, 'I believe,' and wast immersed again, and so wast buried with Christ."

Cyril, of Jerusalem, A. D. 374. "After these things ye were led to the holy pool of divine baptism, as Christ was carried from the cross to the sepulchre. And each of you was asked, Whether he believed, etc.; and ye made that saving confession, and descended three times into the water and ascended again;—and that water of salvation was a grave to you."

After giving the above extracts from the writings of the early fathers in the church, I will now give the reader some statements made by those who have practiced sprinkling and pouring for baptism, but who show by their admissions that they do not claim any authority for their practice derived from the Holy Scriptures, or the meaning of the word.

Witsius affirms,—“It is certain that both John the Baptist, and the disciples of Christ ordinarily practiced immersion? whose example was followed by the ancient church, as Vossius has shown, by producing many testimonies from the Greek and Latin writers.” *Econ. of the Cov. Lib. IV cap. xvi. sec. 13.*

Mr. Bower, “Baptism by immersion was undoubtedly the apostolical practice and was never dispensed with by the church, except in case of sickness,” etc. *Hist. of the Popes.*

G. J. Vossius. That the apostles immersed whom they baptized there is no doubt.....And that the ancient church followed their example is very clearly evinced, by innumerable testimonies of the Fathers. *Disputat. de Bap., Disp. 1. sec. 6.*

Mr. Reeves. The ancients carefully observed immersion, inso-much, that by the “Canons Apostolical,” either Bishop or Presbyter who baptized without it was deposed from the ministry. See the *Canons*, 42 to 50. *Reeves' Apologies of Justin.*

Encyclopaedia Ecclesiastica, a learned and splendid work. Whatever weight may be in these reasons as a defense for the present practice of sprinkling, it is evident that during the first ages of the church, and for many centuries afterward, the practice of immersion prevailed; and which seems indeed never to be departed from, except where it was administered to a person at the point of death, or upon the bed of sickness,—which was considered indeed as not giving the party the full privilege of baptism.” *Article, Baptism.*

Dr. Wall, who explored all the voluminous writers of antiquity in search of evidence of infant baptism, says, "This (immersion) is so plain and clear by an infinite number of passages that as one cannot but pity the weak endeavors of such Pedobaptists as would maintain the negative of it, so we ought to disown and show a dislike of the profane scoffs which some people give to the English Anti-pedobaptists merely for the use of dipping;—when it was, in all probability, the way by which our blessed Saviour, and for certain, was the most usual and ordinary way by which the ancient Christians did receive their baptism. 'Tis a great want of prudence as well as of honesty to refuse to grant to an adversary what is certainly true and may be proved so. It creates a jealousy of all the rest that one says."—"The custom of the Christians in the near succeeding times (to the apostles) being more largely and particularly delivered in books, is known to have been generally, or ordinarily a total immersion." *Hist. of Inf. Baptism*, Pt. II. ch. ix, sec. 2. And its **Defense**.

Dr. Campbell, Professor at Aberdeen. "I have heard a disputant, in defiance of etymology and use, maintain that the word rendered in the New Testament baptize, means more properly to sprinkle than to plunge; and in defiance of all antiquity, that the former was the earliest and the most general practice in baptizing. One who argues in this manner never fails with persons of knowledge to betray the cause he would defend; and though, with respect to the vulgar bold assertions generally succeed as well as argument, and sometimes better; yet a candid mind will always disdain to take the help of falsehood, even in the support of truth." *Lectures on Pulpit Eloquence*.

Edinburgh Presbyterian Reviewers. We cannot but regret therefore, that Dr. Ewing should have been guilty of so many gross and glaring blunders in his endeavor to make out a case in favor of sprinkling..... We have rarely met for example, with a more weak and fanciful piece of reasoning, than that by which Mr. Ewing would persuade us that there is no allusion to the mode of immersion, in the expression "buried with him in baptism." This point ought to be frankly admitted, and indeed cannot be denied with any show of reason. *Review* Vol.1.

Calvin. The word baptize, signifies to immerse, and the rite of immersion was observed by the ancient church.

Next, I shall give some miscellaneous evidence from the testimony of the Greek church whose members read, write, sing, pray and preach in the Greek language. If the word Baptizo ever

means to sprinkle or pour, that church would know it. But it is a fact that they immerse, and never sprinkle. Read the following:

Rev. R. Robinson. The native Greeks must understand their own language better than foreigners, and they have always understood the word **baptism** to signify **dipping**; and, therefore, from their first embracing of Christianity to this day, they have always baptized and do yet baptize, by **immersion**. This is an authority for the meaning of the word infinitely preferable to that of European lexicographers. In this case the Greeks are unexceptionable guides. **History of Baptism.**

Dr. Wall The Greek church in all the branches of it, does still use immersion. **Hist. of Infant Baptism.**

Sir. Ricault. Thrice dipping or plunging, this church holds to be as necessary to the form of baptism as water to the matter. **Pedo. Exam.**

For the convenience of the reader, who may not have the authority at hand I will give some quotations from the lexicons. I shall quote from Pedobaptist scholars here also.

Walderus, A. D. 1537, defines **Baptism**, **Immergo**, **Immero**.

Stephens, A. D. 1572, defines **Immerse**, **submerge**, **bury in water**, **wash**, **bathe**.

Scapula, A. D. 1579, defines **Immerse**, **submerge**, **bury in water**, **wash** **bathe**.

George Pasor, A. D. 1637, defines **Baptize**, **merge**, **bathe**.

J. C. Suicer, A. D. 1659, defines **Immerse**, **wash**.

Schrevelius, A. D. 1667, defines **Baptize**, **merge**, **bathe**.

Leusden, A. D. 1671, defines **Baptize**, **merge**, **bathe**.

Heidericus, A. D. 1772, defines **Merge**, **immerse**, **bury in water**, **wash**, **bathe**, **baptize**.

Schleusner, A. D. 1791, defines (1) **Immerse**, **dip**, **plunge into water**. (2) **Wash**, **bathe**, **cleanse in water**.

Bretschneider, A. D. 1829, defines **Dip** or **bathe** frequently, **bathe**, **wash**, **immerse**, **submerge**.

Donengan, **Immerse** repeatedly into a liquid, **submerge**, **soak**, **saturate**.

Assow, (1) **Immerse** often, **submerge**, hence **moisten**, **wet** (2) **Draw water**, (3) **Baptize**, **wash**.

Liddell & Scott, (1) Dip repeatedly, sink, bathe. (2) Draw water. (3) Baptize.

Greenfield, Immerse, immerge, submerge, sink, wash, cleanse, baptize.

Robinson, Immerse, sink, wash, cleanse by washing, wash one's self, bathe, baptize.

(Quoted from Wilson's History of Sprinkling.)

How long was immersion the almost universal practice? See the following:

Bishop Bossuet. "We are able to make it appear, by the acts of councils, and by the ancient rituals, that for thirteen hundred years, baptism was thus (by immersion) administered throughout the whole church, as far as possible." **Stennett's Answer to Russen.**

Stackhouse. "Several authors have shown, and proved, that this immersion continued, as much as possible, to be used for thirteen hundred years after Christ." **Hist. of the Bible.**

This is sufficient; much more of the same kind could be offered, but we think this is enough to convince all candid minds, that there is absolutely no evidence of any kind worth considering in favor of the unscriptural practice of affusion for baptism.

May the Lord bless all in seeing, believing and obeying the truth. Yours for the right in all things,

JOE S. WARLICK.



The Gospel Guide

JOE S. WARLICK'S
PAPER

*Every Lover of Truth and
Fair Dealing Should Read it.*



\$1.00 the Year in Advance



Address:

JOE S. WARLICK, Station A., Dallas, Texas