

Abilene Christian University

Digital Commons @ ACU

Stone-Campbell Books

Stone-Campbell Resources

1926

Did John the Baptist Sprinkle? A Review of C.T. Thrift's Tract, 'Why John the Baptist Sprinkled the Multitudes at the River Jordan'

F. B. Srygley

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



Part of the [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), [Liturgy and Worship Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Srygley, F. B., "Did John the Baptist Sprinkle? A Review of C.T. Thrift's Tract, 'Why John the Baptist Sprinkled the Multitudes at the River Jordan'" (1926). *Stone-Campbell Books*. 202.
https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books/202

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Stone-Campbell Resources at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Stone-Campbell Books by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU.

10

DID JOHN THE BAPTIST SPRINKLE?

**A Review of C. T. Thrift's Tract, "Why John the
Baptist Sprinkled the Multitudes
at the River Jordan"**

F. B. SRYGLEY

Editor, Gospel Advocate

For additional copies, address

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

110 Seventh Avenue, North

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE



J. W. Thomas

INTRODUCTION

The following pages were written as a review of a pamphlet by C. T. Thrift, who signs himself, "Rev. C. T. Thrift, Pastor of Horne Memorial M. E. Church, South, Clayton, N. C." The arguments of Mr. Thrift in his pamphlet were hardly strong enough to call for a reply, but, according to the advertisements on the back of the tract, it was highly commended by several Methodist preachers and was referred to even as a scholarly production. Since the booklet has been so highly commended, it was thought it should at least be given some notice.

In commendation of his pamphlet, Mr. Thrift quotes from the Nashville Christian Advocate the following: "He has put more into it than any other writer on the subject, as far as we know." While Mr. Thrift quotes this as a commendation of his tract and while it was no doubt intended as such, still it does not say he proved his proposition, but that he "put more into it than any other writer on the subject." I could say this about his tract and still not believe it. I know he put more into it than the Bible does, and some things which I think the Christian Advocate would not have put into it. "Rev." A. D. Betts says of the tract: "A most thorough and scholarly discussion of the subject." Another says of it: "It is a scholarly and Scriptural addition to the literature on the subject." I suppose that such statements as these about Mr. Thrift's pamphlet would be considered a joke among scholars. Mr. Thrift does not even show proper respect for a scholar if he thinks he is in his way. He quotes from Thayer's lexicon and makes the following remark: "We must give up Thayer or the Bible. I give up Thayer." I did not know it was so easy for one scholar to give up another. It is generally known and freely admitted that the great New Testament lexicographer, Joseph H. Thayer, is a scholar, and that his New Testament lexicon has not an equal, and yet the scholarly (?) Mr. Thrift has given him up. No, scholarship is not a strong point in favor of the tract.

I have tried to deal fairly in my replies to Mr. Thrift in this booklet; and while I consider some of his arguments exceedingly weak, and some of his interpretations of the word of God as ludicrous, and some of his treatment of the divine record as unfair, I have not questioned his motives or used any harsh or abusive language about him. While I could not be honest and treat the word of God as he has done in his pamphlet, I do not know the

INTRODUCTION.

trend of his mind or the amount of prejudice which may have blinded his eyes. He may yet, for aught I know, be honest in all that he has said in his tract. I am not his judge, but I am certain that I never could have taken the Bible and read myself into the belief of the position that Mr. Thrift sets forth in his tract. He impresses me as a man who already had his doctrine firmly fixed in his mind and who went to the Bible to force it into the support of his position. He treats the word of God as a shrewd lawyer would a dangerous witness—bend the evidence, if possible, to suit his side; and if not possible to do this, then break down his evidence and throw it out of court. I pray that I may never become so filled with error on any subject that I will be blind to reason, but especially on a question that concerns the eternal interest of our race.

Every reader of this review should remember that the question under discussion herein must be settled, if settled aright, by the Bible. All who are concerned about this question should go to that book with open, unprejudiced minds and read it carefully and prayerfully in order to learn the will of God and then do it. The Bible is plain enough for all to understand it if they go to it in the right way. We generally get from the Bible what we go after. If we go to the Bible with the love of the truth in our hearts, we will get the truth; but if we go to it with our minds made up as to what it must teach, we will get what we go after. The Lord direct us into the truth.

F. B. SRYGLEY.

Nashville, Tenn., July 10, 1926.

A REVIEW OF SPRINKLING FOR BAPTISM

BY F. B. SRYGLEY

Recently a small pamphlet, by C. T. Thrift, on the question, "Why John the Baptist sprinkled the multitude at the river Jordan," fell into my hands. While space would hardly allow me to give a very extensive review of this pamphlet in a newspaper article, there are many mistakes in it which are so glaring that I will point out a few of them. I am told that this pamphlet has been highly indorsed by a number of Methodist preachers and is being circulated as a strong document in favor of sprinkling for baptism. This is my reason for making a few criticisms on Mr. Thrift's tract.

This pamphlet begins with an introduction in these words: "In the very beginning I would make clear the position of Methodists on the subject of water baptism. With us this has never been a cardinal doctrine. The Christian religion is not bound up in forms and ceremonies, but is a matter of the heart. 'Neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.'" (Gal. 6: 15.) 'For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly; . . . but he is a Jew who is one inwardly.' (Rom. 2: 28, 29.) If this was true of a Jew, how much more true is it of the Christian! Is thy heart right with God? This is of much greater importance than the question of water baptism. 'By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body'—that is, into Christ. (1 Cor. 12: 13.) All the water in the world cannot do that. 'If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.' (Rom. 8: 9.) The Master did not make water baptism the badge of discipleship. 'By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.' (John 13: 35.) 'Love therefore is the fulfilling of the law.' (Rom. 13: 10.) Methodism has ever been in harmony

with St. Paul when he says: 'For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel.' (1 Cor. 1: 17.) The gospel 'is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.' (Rom. 1: 16.)"

The above is given as the position of Methodism. There are a number of quotations from the New Testament, but several of them are misinterpreted and all are misapplied. The gentleman says of water baptism: "With us this has never been a cardinal doctrine." "Cardinal" means chief or principal. Then, according to Mr. Thrift, baptism has never been a chief or principal doctrine with Methodists.

Since I have seen how Mr. Thrift treats the word of God, I am not willing to risk him on what has never been the doctrine of Methodists. I would prefer to risk Mr. Wesley as to what that doctrine was in his day, especially since he was the founder of Methodism. On the question of baptism Mr. Wesley said: "But the grand question is, Who are the proper subjects of baptism? Grown persons only, or infants also? In order to answer this fully, I shall, first, lay down the grounds of infant baptism, taken from Scripture, reason, and primitive universal practice, and, secondly, answer the objections against it. As to the grounds of it: If infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects of baptism; seeing, in the ordinary way, they cannot be saved, unless this be washed away by baptism. It has been already proved that this original stain cleaves to every child of man; and thereby they are children of wrath and liable to eternal damnation. It is true the second Adam has found a remedy for the disease which came upon all by the offense of the first. But the benefit of this is to be received through the means which he hath appointed for that purpose, and to which he hath tied us, though he may not have tied himself." (Treatise on Baptism, in "Doctrinal Tracts," page 251.)

This looks to me like infant baptism was a "cardinal doctrine" with Mr. Wesley, who was the founder of Methodism, and yet Mr. Thrift says, "with us it has never been a cardinal doctrine." Mr. Wesley says: "If infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects of

baptism; seeing, in the ordinary way, they cannot be saved, unless this be washed away by baptism." According to Mr. Wesley, water baptism washes away original sin from the infant, and yet Mr. Thrift says that "water baptism has *never* been a cardinal doctrine" with the Methodists. In the case of infant baptism, according to Mr. Wesley, baptism *alone* washes away sin; and still it is not "cardinal," according to Mr. Thrift. It seems to me that, according to Mr. Wesley, it is not only cardinal, but that it is the whole thing. Speaking about baptismal regeneration and water salvation, if Mr. Wesley did not teach it, it cannot be taught, for the simple reason that the infant can neither believe nor repent.

The gentleman says: "The Christian religion is not bound up in forms and ceremonies, but is a matter of the heart." It is a matter of the heart all right; but if he means by the first part of the statement that the sinner has no form of doctrine that he must obey from the heart, I hereby enter my denial to his statement. On this point hear the apostle: "But thanks be to God, that, whereas ye were servants of sin, ye became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching whereunto ye were delivered; and being made free from sin, ye became servants of righteousness." (Rom. 6: 17, 18.) No one can obey the form of teaching unless it is done *from the heart*; but because the heart must be in the act of obedience to God is no proof that one is not required to obey God. The heart is not right when one refuses to obey him. Of course circumcision availed nothing after the law of circumcision was abolished, but to say that the Jews were not required to circumcise their male children while that law was in force is to speak against the facts. The law of circumcision reads: "And the uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant." (Gen. 17: 14.) It is true that he is not a Jew who is *only* a Jew outwardly; but one had to be a Jew inwardly as well as outwardly to be a true Jew. But this fact does not prove that he had the right to disobey God or refuse to keep his commandments. Neither can one be a Christian and refuse to obey God.

Yes, the Common Version says: "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." But if that were the correct translation, then I would insist that we are baptized *by* the Spirit, not as an agent in acting, for the Spirit was never the agent in acting by which any one was baptized; but these brethren were baptized by the Spirit as an agent in directing. It was the Holy Spirit through Peter who commanded them: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins." (Acts 2: 38.) Therefore, the Holy Spirit was the agent in directing their baptism. But the passage under consideration as it reads in the Revision is: "For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body." The truth is, they were all, both Jew and Gentile, *in the same Spirit*—that is, the spirit of obedience—when they were baptized into the one body. The context shows that the question was the unity of the body, made up of both Jews and Gentiles, which was the thing under consideration, and that, therefore, it is correctly rendered "in" by the revisers. It is true that "all the water in the world" cannot put one into the body of Christ, but God can do it, and will do so if we are baptized *in* the right spirit. Water does put one into the body of the Methodist Church. Mr. Thrift himself can put them in no other way. Yes, it is true that "by this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another," and it is also true that "hereby we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and do his commandments." (1 John 5: 2.) According to this statement, one can know that he loves God's children only when he loves God and keeps his commandments. "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ." (Acts 10: 48.) How can Mr. Thrift know that he loves the children of God should he refuse to obey the command to be baptized?

Yes, it is true that Paul said: "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." But that does not prove that Paul had no authority to baptize, for he did baptize several at Corinth. Paul's chief business was to preach the gospel, while others did the baptizing for him. All Paul's converts were baptized either by himself or

Timothy or some other competent man. Any one with ability enough to take one down into the water and bury him in baptism could baptize, but it required inspiration to preach the gospel as first preached by the apostles, and Paul had it. This is far from saying that the penitent believer should not be baptized, especially since Jesus said in giving the commission: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." (Mark 16: 15, 16.) From these facts it appears to me that the bottom is out of Mr. Thrift's introduction. I give this much as a sample of what may be expected of the pamphlet.

DID JOHN THE BAPTIST SPRINKLE FOR BAPTISM?

Last week I called attention to a pamphlet written by C. T. Thrift on "Why John the Baptist Sprinkled the Multitude at the River Jordan." I examined only a few things which Mr. Thrift said in the introduction to his booklet.

He calls his first argument "The Teaching of Prophecy." Mr. Thrift begins this argument, or division, with the following: "In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea. . . . Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him." (Matt. 3: 1, 5, 6.) It will be noted that Mr. Thrift claims that he here quotes three verses from the third chapter of Matthew. It is true he gave all of the first and fifth verses, but in the sixth verse he quotes only five words out of ten and stops the quotation exactly in the middle of the verse and in the middle of the sentence where there is not even a comma. That is not a nice way to treat the word of God. The sixth verse reads: "And were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." Why did he stop the quotation at "him" instead of at the end of the sentence? "And were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." That part of the sentence that he

left out tells too much for his theory. If the gentleman had quoted the entire sentence, his readers could see that he had his pamphlet named wrongly. The name of the pamphlet is, "Why John the Baptist Sprinkled the Multitude at the Jordan River;" while that part of the sentence which he refused to allow his readers to see says they were baptized "*in Jordan*." It was easier for him to cut out a part of the statement of Holy Writ than it was to change the name of his booklet. I do not desire to be in the position of a man who would treat the word of God that way.

Speaking of this mutilated quotation, the gentleman says: "This baptizing caused many to think that he was the Christ; so the Jews sent priests and Levites to ask him, 'Who art thou?' When he said that he was not the Christ, they asked him this very significant question: 'Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?' (John 1: 25.)" The gentleman is right in the statement that the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, "Who art thou?" but he is guessing when he intimates that they were moved to do so alone because he baptized. It is true, no doubt, that he baptized by the authority of God, but he also did some very plain preaching by the same authority. The gentleman draws this erroneous conclusion: "It follows, then, that baptism was one of the identification marks of all these three."

The gentleman thinks that this question meant that the prophet Elias, or Elijah, and Moses both baptized. By no means; but it means that here was an act which John was doing by the authority of God, and still he was not Elijah or Moses or Christ. The Jews believed from their prophets that Elijah must come before the prophet who was like Moses, which was the Christ. Jesus settled that question with his disciples by showing them that John the Baptist was the Elijah that should come and restore all things. (Matt. 17: 9-13.) Instead of this proving that Elijah and Moses baptized, it proves the opposite. If Moses and Elijah had done as much baptizing as Mr. Thrift seems to think they did, it would not have surprised the Jews for John the Baptist to baptize the multi-

tude. It was a strange thing with the Jews; hence, they asked, "Why baptizest thou?"

The gentleman thinks he has a fine point on what he calls "mistaken identity." These are his words: "Who was that prophet? It was the prophet spoken of by Moses. (Deut. 8: 15, 18.) He was to be like Moses. Well, Moses was preëminently a 'sprinkler' and not an immersionist, according to Leviticus and Deuteronomy. So John must have been sprinkling." Moses did do some sprinkling, but he never sprinkled for baptism, neither did John.

Mr. Thrift then asks: "What about Elias? Well, in the contest on Mount Carmel, Elijah did not immerse the burnt offering and wood in water, but poured the water upon them. The return of Elijah is prophesied in Malachi. (Mal. 3: 14; 4: 5.) This messenger was to prepare the way of the Lord; he was to purify the sons of Levi. (Mal. 3: 3.) The Jews purified by sprinkling and not by immersion. So John must have sprinkled, or he would not have been mistaken for Elias." The gentleman is easily satisfied with an argument. The only case that he could find for Elijah baptizing was where he poured so much water on the altar, on the wood and the sacrifice, that it filled the ditches about the altar. Pray, what did that have to do with baptism? It is not referred to as baptism at all, and was the altar, the sacrifice, and the wood upon which this water was poured; and if that was baptism, it was these that was baptized and not the people. But the gentleman tries to draw a conclusion, and it is this: "So John must have been sprinkling." If it was so, it was not sprinkling, but it was pouring, and in great quantities at that. The gentleman may be good at some things, but it is not in drawing a logical conclusion. Because Elijah poured water, John the Baptist sprinkled for baptism! If the gentleman's doctrine is as weak as his logic, it will never stand alone.

Again, Mr. Thrift says: "Why did they think John was Christ? Because he was baptizing. Then there must be prophecies in the Old Testament concerning the baptismal work of the Messiah. If those prophecies state the mode of that baptizing, it must be accepted as final, as deter-

mining the manner of John's baptizing. In Isa. 52: 15 we read this prophecy of Christ: 'So shall he sprinkle many nations.' So John must have been sprinkling." The trouble with the gentleman is that every time he sees "sprinkle" he thinks it means baptism, but not so. "Sprinkle" comes from a different word altogether. The gentleman admits that in the Revision the margin reads, "So shall he startle many nations," and the context would indicate that "startle" is the meaning of the word. Begin reading with verse 14: "Like 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 [or, startle] many nations." It will be noted that the prophet speaks of many being astonished at Christ, also of his visage being "marred more than any man," which would be enough to startle the nations. This would indicate that "startle" and not "sprinkle" is the word. But granting that it is "sprinkle," how does the gentleman know that the prophet meant that he would baptize many nations by sprinkling? The gentleman's trouble is that every time he sees "sprinkle" he thinks it means baptism; and then when he gets all he can out of that, he begins to look for the word "pour." But I would remind him that if "sprinkle" means baptism, "pour" does not, unless "sprinkle" means "pour," which it does not. Sometimes baptism may mean *wash*, but it never means *sprinkle*. The washings of the old covenant may have typified baptism, but the sprinkling never did. "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience: and having our body washed with pure water." (Heb. 10: 22.) If the prophet meant that Christ would sprinkle the nations, then this sprinkling is done on the heart, and therefore could not mean baptism, for the act of baptism is performed on the body. He who puts sprinkling for baptism puts baptism where the New Testament put the effect of the blood of Christ. This is doing exactly what I have been falsely accused of doing—putting water where Christ has put blood. The washing in the passage may refer to baptism, but the sprinkling cannot, for it was done on the heart. If there is any doubt about how the body is washed, we can learn how it was done from the Bible.

With reference to the healing of Naaman, the record says: "And Elisha sent a messenger unto him, saying, Go and wash in the Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again to thee, and thou shalt be clean." (2 Kings 5: 10.) Naaman finally decided to obey the instruction of the prophet, and it is said: "Then went he down, and dipped himself seven times in the Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God; and his flesh came again like unto the flesh of a little child." (Verse 14.) Thus we see for one to wash is to dip himself in the water; therefore, when the body is washed, it is dipped.

The gentleman further says: "If we reject the passage in Isaiah, what have we left? There is the prophecy in Ezek. 36: 35: 'Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean.' This undoubtedly refers to the time of Christ." It undoubtedly refers to no such thing. This prophecy was made while the children of Israel were in Babylon, and it was fulfilled on their return to their own land. The context shows this. Begin reading with verse 23: "And I will sanctify my great name, which was profaned among the heathen, which ye have profaned in the midst of them; and the heathen shall know that I am the Lord, saith the Lord God, when I shall be sanctified in you before their eyes. For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land. Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you." (Ezek. 36: 23-25.) It is a broad assertion and against the facts to say, "This undoubtedly refers to the time of Christ." But if it does refer to the time of Christ, there is nothing in the passage that even remotely intimates that the sprinkling of the passage is baptism. This is purely an assumption, and it is against all of the facts. I do not believe that the gentleman knows what "clean water" as here used is. A receipt for the making of this "clean water," or water of cleansing, can be found in the nineteenth chapter of Numbers. "And a man that is clean shall gather up the ashes of the heifer, and lay them up without the camp in a clean place; and it shall be kept for the congregation of the children of

Israel for a water of separation: it is a purification for sin." (Verse 9.) The ashes of the heifer were sprinkled in water, and this weak lye was kept as the water of cleansing, or "clean water." I here and now assert that the old law commanded no one to sprinkle unmixed water in cleansing from sin. This water of cleansing was sprinkled. "And the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean on the third day, and on the seventh day: and on the seventh day he shall purify himself, and wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and shall be clean at even." (Verse 19.) The gentleman cannot see this, because he is only looking for sprinkling, when, as a matter of fact, it is never used as baptism or to typify it.

I may notice a few other things in Mr. Thrift's pamphlet later.

IS SPRINKLING BAPTISM?

Continuing the examination of C. T. Thrift's pamphlet, "Why John the Baptist Sprinkled the Multitudes at the River Jordan," I wish to make a few remarks to make clear the issue. Mr. Thrift talks much about the *mode* of baptism; but I would remind him of the fact that there is no controversy over the *mode* of baptism, but it is over the *act* of baptism. "Mode" means "manner." Therefore, the mode of baptism is simply the manner of baptism; and I suppose that he and I would agree that the best manner is the right mode. God has not legislated on the subject of the manner of baptizing, but on baptism itself. If sprinkling is a mode or manner of baptizing, and pouring is a mode of baptism, and immersion is a mode, then what is baptism, of which sprinkling, pouring, and immersion are only modes? Sprinkling is not a mode or manner of pouring, neither is immersion a mode of sprinkling. If sprinkling is baptism, pouring is not, unless sprinkling is pouring, which it is not. When Christ commanded the apostles to baptize the nations, he commanded them to perform an act which was definite and which they could and did understand.

Resuming the review of Mr. Thrift's pamphlet, I quote from him the following: "This argument from prophecy

is so far-reaching and conclusive that I will restate it in another form. John Smith was coming down the street, when Sheriff Brown, who had never seen him before, stepped up to him and said: 'Joshua Jones, consider yourself under arrest.' Smith replied: 'I am not Joshua Jones. What made you think so?' The sheriff replied: 'I have orders to look out for Joshua Jones, who was coming this way on a spotted horse.' How was Smith traveling? Mr. Thrift would prove from this illustration that since, as he believes, the prophet said of Christ, "So shall he sprinkle many nations," and since some thought that John the Baptist was Christ, therefore Christ baptized by sprinkling. The weakness in this argument is that the prophet did not say, "So shall Christ baptize by sprinkling." The prophet in the passage under consideration said nothing about Christ's baptizing. This is assuming the controversy. Christ never used the word "sprinkle," or "rantizo," to describe baptism; but he used the word "baptizo," or baptize, which is a different word altogether. Christ with his own hands baptized no one; John did. Therefore, it was not said to the sheriff that Joshua Jones should come riding a "spotted horse," but he was to be driving a spotted cow, and because John Smith was riding a spotted horse the sheriff thought that he was Joshua Jones. A sheriff that interprets like a Methodist preacher arrests the wrong man.

The gentleman then asks the question, "How was Christ baptized?" In his answer to this question Mr. Thrift says of Christ: "He was to be a priest like his brethren and above them." Well, what of it? On the question of the priesthood of Christ, Mr. Thrift says: "Like his brethren, he was consecrated to the priesthood at thirty years old, by sprinkling water upon him. (Luke 3: 21; Num. 8: 7.)" There is not one word in either of these passages about Christ's being made priest. Luke 3: 21 states that Jesus was baptized, but it does not say that he entered the priesthood by the act of baptism. If Mr. Thrift were familiar with the teaching of the New Testament on the question of the priesthood of Christ, he would know that he was not made a priest in Jordan or on the bank of the Jordan. He was not priest while on

the earth. On this point hear the apostle: "For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law." (Heb. 8: 4.) He could not have been a priest until the old law was abolished. "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law. For he of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah; of which tribe Moses spoke nothing concerning priesthood." (Heb. 7: 12-14.) The law was abolished at the death of Christ, and so the priesthood could not have changed till after his death. He was not made a priest by baptism, but by the oath of God. "For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated forevermore." (Verse 28.) "For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath." (Verse 21.) Christ never was priest till he sat down upon his throne at the right hand of God. "Even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne; and the counsel of peace shall be between them both." (Zech. 6: 13.) The one who says that Christ was baptized into his priestly office simply talks like a parrot and not like the word of God.

Mr. Thrift makes this bold assertion: "Sprinkling and pouring constitute Bible baptism." Well, if they do, one would have to do both to be baptized. If sprinkling is baptism, pouring is not; if pouring is baptism, sprinkling is not; if sprinkling and pouring is baptism, neither is baptism without the other.

Mr. Thrift states one of his positions on baptism in these words: "*Sprinkling and pouring constitute Bible baptism.*" It will be noted that he does not say sprinkling or pouring constitutes Bible baptism, but "*sprinkling and pouring.*" If sprinkling and pouring constitute Bible baptism, then sprinkling alone would not constitute it; neither would pouring alone, but it would take both to do it. Baptism is an act; so is "sprinkle," and so is "pour." How the act of baptism can be performed by

either of two things that differ as much as "sprinkle" and "pour" is more than I can see. "Sprinkle" means to scatter in drops, while "pour" means to send out in a stream. If one is the act of baptism, the other is not.

As a description of baptism in the Old Testament, Mr. Thrift makes the following quotation: "'And Moses stretched out his hand over the sea; and the Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea dry land, and the waters were divided. And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground: and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand, and on their left.' (Ex. 14: 21, 22.) Here is what the psalmist says about the same affair (Ps. 77: 16, 17): 'The waters saw thee, O God, the waters saw thee; they were afraid: the depths also were troubled. The clouds poured out water: the skies sent out a sound,' 'Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were . . . baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.' (1 Cor. 10: 1, 2.)"

Mr. Thrift says: "Here is what the Psalmist says about the same affair." I do not believe that the Psalmist was talking about "the same affair." The quotation from Exodus says: "The children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground." If it were "the same affair," as the gentleman says, how could the ground have been dry, when the clouds were pouring out water? May it not be true that the clouds poured out water just before or immediately after they crossed the sea? As a matter of fact, it could not have been the cloud in which they were baptized that poured out water, for the reason that that cloud was not a rain cloud, but a cloud of fire. "And the Lord went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, to lead them the way; and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light; to go by day and night." (Ex. 13: 21.) Since the children of Israel crossed the sea at night, it was, therefore, a cloud of fire. "And the angel of God, which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them; and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them: and it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel; and it

was a cloud and darkness to them, but it gave light by night to these: so that the one came not near the other all the night." (Ex. 14: 19, 20.) Let it be noted that Paul says, in speaking of the passage of the sea, "And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." This was not water baptism at all, but it was a cloud-and-sea baptism. It was a type of baptism, but it was "in the cloud and in the sea." The water of the sea, being congealed, stood a wall upon either side of them as they crossed the sea. David said of the passage of the sea: "Egypt was glad when they departed: for the fear of them fell upon them. He spread a cloud for a covering; and fire to give light in the night." (Ps. 105: 38, 39.) Thus in their baptism they were covered up in the cloud and in the sea. They were buried in the cloud and sea; and since it was a cloud-and-sea baptism, it was a burial. This agrees with the apostle's definition of baptism: "Buried with him by baptism into death." (Rom. 6: 4.) The Bible is so plain on the subject of baptism that there is no excuse for any one's misunderstanding it.

I hope to examine a few other things in Mr. Thrift's pamphlet in the near future.

IS BAPTISM POURING?

After Mr. Thrift had tried by several things to prove that baptism is *sprinkling*, he then undertakes to prove that it is *pouring*. He makes no explanation for his change from sprinkling to pouring, though the two are very different; and if it is the one, it cannot be the other. He quotes Joel: "And it shall come to pass afterwards, that I [the Lord] will pour out my spirit upon all flesh." With him, that is enough to prove that baptism is pouring, though the prophet did not say so. He also quotes from Acts 1: 5: "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." The gentleman assumes that the pouring is the baptism, though neither passage says so; but it must be so, to fit Mr. Thrift's theology. Any one ought to be able to see that if the pouring was the baptism, then the Holy Spirit was baptized, and not

the apostles, for the Holy Spirit was poured. The pouring was not the baptism, but it was preparatory to it. The pouring took place before the baptism. To show what took place at the time the Savior's prediction was fulfilled, Mr. Thrift correctly quotes these words: "And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost." This he quotes to show what the baptism of the Holy Spirit was, and he is correct here; but this was not the pouring, but it followed the pouring. Therefore, I am right in saying that the pouring was not the baptism, but it was preparatory to it. It was the spirits of the apostles that were baptized with the Holy Spirit, and not their bodies. If, then, they were filled with the Holy Spirit, their spirits must have been completely submerged in the Holy Spirit, and therefore baptism is a covering up, or a burial, and not sprinkling or pouring.

Under the heading, "Some Additional Light," our friend perpetrates the following strange and ludicrous interpretation of a well-known passage: "Christ asked the multitude concerning John, 'What went ye out into the wilderness to see? A reed shaken with the wind?' Was it by chance that Jesus used this figure of speech? If John had been immersing, it would have had no special significance. But according to prophecy, John was sprinkling, and the figure of the wind shaking the reed becomes quite luminous. John is baptizing the multitude who flocked to him. He takes a hyssop branch and dips it in water and sprinkles the people. . . . When they draw near, they are unable to see John, who is down at the water's edge, for the multitude. All they can see to indicate where John is, is the waving of the hyssop branch, which looks like a reed shaken with the wind." This is purely imaginary; and yet he says, with this imaginary interpretation, the passage becomes "luminous." If the gentleman cannot prove sprinkling by inference, he certainly will be able to do so by his imagination, because he has a brilliant imagination. What was Jesus teaching by "the reed shaken with the wind?" Nothing, according to Mr.

Thrift's imagination, but sprinkling for baptism, though that question was not under consideration at all.

What about the next question Jesus asked concerning John: "But what went ye out for to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? behold, they that wear soft raiment are in kings' houses." I wonder what this verse teaches about John's sprinkling the multitude. I suppose, as they could not see John, they imagined he had on soft clothing. This interpretation would be amusing if it were not such a serious question. Adam Clarke, a Methodist commentator, says of the passage: "*A reed shaken with the wind.* An emblem of an irresolute, unsteady mind."

Mr. Thrift then tries to prove his erroneous doctrine by pictures which show John pouring water on Christ's head. But if his life depended upon it he could not prove that the man who made the picture saw John baptize Christ. He should prove his practice by the Bible, and not by a picture which some one made sometime, somewhere, with no more actual knowledge of the facts than Mr. Thrift.

Again, he says: "When Christ was baptized, the Holy Spirit descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him." Well, what does that prove as to how he was baptized? Nothing whatever.

Mr. Thrift does not think John could have baptized so many unless he did it with a bunch of hyssop—by wholesale, so to speak. But Methodist preachers do not baptize them that way now. They make converts now at the mourners' bench, and it sometimes takes several days to "get one through."

But the gentleman says: "The Christian religion does not impose onerous rites and burdensome ceremonies." In this he is trying to prove that the Christian religion does not impose a "burial in baptism" on people; but this is not near so "onerous" as the Methodist system of getting religion at the mourners' bench. The gentleman thinks that baptism cannot be a burial, because some preachers put off baptism till summer time. Those preachers who do this are, no doubt, like Mr. Thrift in one par-

ticular—they do not believe that baptism has anything to do with one's salvation. If I were like them, I would put it off, not only till summer time, but forever. What good does it do to baptize any one, if one is saved without it?

The gentleman then undertakes to examine the cases of baptism in the New Testament. Of the case of the eunuch he says: "The 'going down into the water' and the 'coming up from the water' proves nothing here, as it proves nothing anywhere else, as to the mode of baptism; for both Philip and the eunuch went down into the water, and they both came up out of it. So if that pertained to their baptism, then they both were baptized." That is not a wise statement by any means. Going down into the water did *pertain* to the baptism, but no one believes that this act was the baptism. Going down into the water was before the baptism, and coming up out of the water was after the baptism. If I should say that the sheriff and the prisoner both went to the gallows, and he hanged him, would that prove that both of them were hanged? Going to the gallows was not the hanging, but it evidently pertained to it. If Philip immersed the eunuch, it was necessary that they both go down into the water; but if he sprinkled him, it was not necessary for either to go down into the water. But the gentleman says that the baptism occurred in the desert. I deny that statement. True, the angel of the Lord said to Philip: "Arise, and go toward the south unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza, which is desert." But it was Gaza which was desert. "Desert" here means deserted. Old Gaza was desert, or deserted, and the new Gaza had been built, but the old Gaza road was still there. If Mr. Thrift would use his judgment more and his imagination less, he would know that there are four streams that cross that road and flow into the Mediterranean Sea. Any good Biblical map will show this fact. Yet Mr. Thrift would try to make us believe that the country was a desert without water or vegetation. Too many travelers from this country have passed that way

within the last half century for any Methodist preacher to make any intelligent man believe there is no stream on that road. But if I myself were to stand at the very place where Philip baptized the eunuch and could see no water there, I would know that some change had taken place since this baptism occurred; for on that day the eunuch said: "See, here is water." It was not only water that could be seen, but there was a sufficient quantity for two men to get into it; for the Bible says that "both Philip and the eunuch" "went down into the water." But Mr. Thrift can see sprinkling in the imaginary waving of a hyssop branch, when there is not one word said about it, and yet he can see nothing that even pertains to baptism in the fact that both Philip and the eunuch went down into the water, and he baptized him. I am unable to see how any man can be so full of prejudice.

Paul could not have been immersed, according to Mr. Thrift, for he says: "The natural supposition is, the whole transaction took place in the house of Judas." If he was sprinkled, why did Ananias say, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord?" Ananias could have sprinkled him as well or better sitting than he could standing; but if he was immersed, it was necessary for him to arise and go to where he could be baptized. But Paul tells how he was baptized: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death." (Rom. 6: 3, 4.) How were you baptized, Paul? "We were buried with him by baptism." But Mr. Thrift can see nothing in this, because it does not suit his theory. Strange that people will delude themselves and others by such false reasoning.

A STRIKING COMPARISON.

Under the above caption, Mr. Thrift in his pamphlet compares "the record of Pentecost" with the prophecy of Ezekiel. He quotes Ezek. 36: 24: "For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all coun-

tries, and will bring you into your own land." Mr. Thrift thinks he finds the fulfillment of this prophecy on the day of Pentecost because it was said of that day that "there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven." This prophecy was made while the Jews were in captivity, and it refers to their return to their own land at the end of the seventy years of captivity. Mr. Thrift would be able to see this were it not for the fact that the prophecy of Ezekiel has sprinkling in it, and he imagines this sprinkling refers to baptism, though there is nothing in the text to indicate it. But it must be so, because Mr. Thrift is bound to prove that sprinkling is baptism. He then quotes again from Ezekiel: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean." He is sure this refers to the baptism of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost. I have already shown that "clean water" was the water of cleansing that the law of Moses required. Mr. Thrift teaches that baptism has nothing to do with cleansing from sin; yet, according to this prophecy, which he says was fulfilled in the baptism of three thousand, the sprinkling was in order to their cleansing. Thus, in trying to prove that sprinkling is baptism, he has proved that it is in order to the remission of sins. But what does that matter with an ordinary Methodist preacher? He will break his neck on one point to get around another. It will also be noted that following this sprinkling the prophet said: "A new heart also will I give you." But the Methodists have the new heart before they are sprinkled, except in the case of the infant, and then faith, repentance, prayer, conversion, and all follow the baptism. The Methodists have two systems of salvation, one for the infant and the other for the adult. In the case of the salvation of an adult, according to Methodism, one must believe, repent, pray, and be pardoned before baptism; but when they come to the infant, they have to move their waterworks and allow the baptism to come first. Thus they have two systems of salvation, one for the father and mother and the other for the infant. It will also be noted that after the Jews were sprinkled with the clean water the prophet said: "I will put my spirit within you." Does this sound like Methodism? But he

must have sprinkling if he has to break his theological neck in order to get it. No, beloved, this sprinkling was for the Jews, and could only refer to the Christian dispensation as a type of the blood of Christ.

The gentleman does not think that the Philippian jailer could have been immersed, because one would have to suppose that they went to the river or that they had a bathtub or something else in which to immerse. I do not think a Methodist preacher should object to a little supposition, when his entire theory of infant baptism and sprinkling for baptism is based upon supposition. Does he not suppose that when the prophet said, "So shall he sprinkle many nations," that he meant that he would baptize many nations by sprinkling? Is it not a supposition that when Ezekiel said, "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you," that he meant baptism? Was he not *supposing* that John was using a hyssop branch near the Jordan when he was baptizing? Was he not *supposing* that the multitude could not see John, but could only see the hyssop branch waving, and thought it was "a reed shaken with the wind?" He is the last man that ought to object to a little supposing, for this is about all he has done in his pamphlet. Look at the facts as stated by the divine historian without any supposition. When the earthquake came, the apostles were in the inner prison, and the record says: "Then he [the jailer] called for a light, and sprang in, and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas, and brought them out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" (Acts 16: 29, 30.) It will be admitted that he brought them out of the inner prison into the outer prison, where the preaching was done. There is no supposition about that fact. After the apostles had spoken unto them the word of the Lord, the record says: "And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway." There is, therefore, no supposition about the fact that "he took them" from the place where the preaching was done to the place where the jailer was baptized, because the record says he did. It is not merely a supposition that he took them to where there was water, for the record says, "and washed their stripes," which means he

bathed their lacerated backs, a thing which he could not have done without water. These are facts stated by the divine record without any supposition.

The gentleman then tries his hand on the case of Lydia. He asks the question, "Where did the baptism take place?" He admits the place of prayer was by the riverside, but he says no one can affirm that the baptism was there. I think a man could affirm that the baptism was near there. The place of prayer was by the riverside, but the place where Lydia and her household were baptized was in the river near the riverside. The gentleman makes the following wise (?) remark: "If Lydia was immersed, it was either with her clothes on or naked." That statement is neither wise nor nice, and it was no doubt written because it was not nice. This is an indecent suggestion, and it was made in order to cast a reflection upon a command of God. "The impotent man answered and said, Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool." I could say the same thing about this man. He was expecting to be put into the pool with his "clothes on or naked;" but it never occurred to me that the poor fellow was lying there naked ready for some man to put him into the pool; but there is as much reason for that statement as there is for the other. I almost lose confidence in some people's sincerity when I see them trying to defend error.

On the baptism of Cornelius and his household, the gentleman says: "They were gathered together in the house of Cornelius. Whatever took place occurred there, as far as we know. Peter said: 'Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?' (As always, the Holy Ghost fell on them.)" This parenthetical statement made by Mr. Thrift is a supposition of his, and it is also against the facts. If that be so, why did Peter say, "As I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning?" (Acts 11: 15.) Why did not Mr. Thrift speak like Peter instead of contradicting him? But Mr. Thrift adds: "If language has any meaning, this means that water was to be brought to them, and not that they should be carried to the water." Speaking about *suppo-*

sition, what is that but supposition? If the tanner should say, "Can any man forbid ooze, that this leather should not be tanned" would that prove that the ooze must be brought to the leather, or that there was no meaning in language? Mr. Thrift is very vehement, but exceedingly weak, in his statements. He vehemently asserts that "there were no facilities in Jerusalem for immersion, except in the reservoirs of water used for drinking and cooking." A man who would make such a statement as that has more courage than information. Why not get up another supposition against the facts and suppose that that was the reason no one would put the impotent man into the pool of Bethesda, as it might pollute the water which they used for drinking water? He talks about immersionists circulating things in out-of-the-way places, rural mill districts," etc. He had better stay in some dark corner of the earth if he expects people to believe that there were no pools or bathing places about Jerusalem except the reservoirs that were used for drinking water. Mr. Thrift's statement about the pools of Jerusalem is contradicted by all intelligent people who know the facts.

"THE PURPOSE OF BAPTISM."

Under the above caption Mr. Thrift conducts quite a lengthy argument with the apostle Paul on "Baptism is a Burial," Paul affirming and C. T. Thrift denying. Mr. Thrift begins his negative with the following statement: "But the immersionist says that baptism represents a 'burial and resurrection,' and therefore immersion is the only baptism." Mr. Thrift in the first part of that statement misrepresents his opponent, as Paul does not say that baptism *represents* a burial, but he says it *is* a burial. "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." (Col. 2: 12.) It is wrong for Mr. Thrift to misrepresent his opponent. He represents Paul correctly when he says "immersion is the only baptism," for Paul said "one Lord, one faith, one baptism." If immersion is baptism, sprinkling and pour-

ing are not, for there is but one. Remember, we are not talking about the *mode* of baptism, but the act of baptism, and that act is a burial. "Buried with him in baptism." (Paul.)

But Mr. Thrift argues with Brother Paul in these words: "Prophecy is dead against him." No, there is no prophecy against baptism being a burial; because, if there had been, Paul never would have said, "Buried with him in baptism."

Mr. Thrift becomes very generous with his opponent in these words: "But we will allow the idea standing room, so that we may get a chance to try it out at the bar of reason and see if it has any legs to stand upon." It is very considerate to give Paul's affirmation one chance to see if his position "has any legs." Baptism as a burial does not stand on legs; it stands on the authority of the inspiration of the apostle who said it was.

Again, he asks: "Whose burial and resurrection does baptism represent?" Since he is debating with Paul, I will allow Paul to answer the question: "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." (Rom. 6: 4.) If the apostle does not answer the gentleman's question, I am unable to see how it could be done. Mr. Thrift says there are two theories—one that baptism represents Christ's burial and resurrection, and the other that of the burial and resurrection of the believer—and that "we will examine each in turn." I protest against Mr. Thrift's bringing in any other opponent. Let him stay with the apostle; and if he succeeds in overthrowing his arguments on this question, we have nothing further to say. He says: "When we come to examine baptism as emblematic of Christ's burial and resurrection, we are met on the threshold with no 'ipse dixit' of our Lord. He never said he baptized as a memorial or as an emblem of my 'burial and resurrection.'" Now, Brother Paul, I guess that gives you a setback. The Lord never said it, and therefore you had no right to say it—"buried with him in baptism." In other words, Paul had no right to

say anything, even by the authority of the Holy Spirit, except in the words which it is recorded the Lord used.

Mr. Thrift asks the question: "Would the hasty plunging of the convert into water suggest burial to an Oriental?" Why so "hasty," and why "plunge" into the water? I see nothing like that in the case of Philip and the eunuch as they "went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him." A decent man will assist one decently in obeying a command of God. Again, he asks: "Would the dilapidated appearance of the convert as he rises from the so-called 'liquid grave' ever suggest to any one the glorious resurrection of our Lord? I judge not, to a man who is as full of prejudice against this command as Mr. Thrift. Why say 'dilapidated appearance?' There is nothing dilapidated about it when decently done, any more than the resurrected Lazarus was dilapidated when Jesus said: 'Loose him, and let him go.' No, Mr. Thrift, the one who believes Paul's statement, 'Buried with him in baptism,' rejoices to see penitent believers obey God according to the statement of the apostle.

The gentleman then asks the question: "Which comes first, death or burial?" And he answers his own question by saying: "Death, of course." Yes, death comes before the burial—that is, death to the love and practice of sin; and while one is thus dead to sin he should be buried in baptism and "arise to walk in newness of life." It will be noted from this statement of the apostle that the new life begins at the burial. But Mr. Thrift thinks that could not represent the burial, because the Lord's Supper, of which one is to partake after baptism, could not represent the death of Christ. In other words, Paul, Mr. Thrift's opponent, is wrong in saying that baptism is a burial, if the Lord's Supper represents the death of Christ. I do not know how others feel about it, but I am still inclined to stay with the apostle, Mr. Thrift to the contrary notwithstanding. Hear him further as he argues with the apostle: "On this theory a disciple may have the death of Christ pictured to him thousands of times in the Lord's Supper, but his burial and resurrection only once in baptism." I do not know what Paul would

say in answer to that were he living, but my idea is that since we have the picture but once and the command to be baptized but once, we had better make sure of it and obey it. Mr. Thrift makes the following thrust at the apostle's statement, "buried in baptism:" "Such a system is not symmetrical, but very lopsided, and is therefore suspicious." That is hard on Paul's system; but I had rather be in Paul's place than in the place of the man who said it.

After two or three pages of argumentation with the apostle, the gentleman finally lets the apostle out in these words: "The truth is, that in the sixth chapter of Romans St. Paul is not talking about water baptism." Ah! I see. The whole controversy grew out of a misunderstanding! He is confident that Paul was talking about the Spirit, for he said in another place: "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." That passage does not mean Holy Spirit baptism; but if it does and it is *by* one Spirit instead of *in* one Spirit that they were all baptized into one body, it was by the Spirit as an agent in directing the baptism. The Holy Spirit never did baptize any one as an agent in acting. God baptized *with* or *in* the Spirit, but the Spirit did not do the baptizing, only as he commanded the apostles to baptize. But as evidence that the gentleman is wrong, I submit the passage itself. According to Paul's statement in the sixth chapter of Romans, they died and were buried and raised up to walk in newness of life. If this was Holy Spirit baptism, they were buried in the Spirit and raised up out of him and walked. If this be true, they left the Spirit when they arose from the burial. This is exactly what is done in water baptism. One is buried in the water, raised up out of it, and walks or lives the new life. If the gentleman had no theory to support, I believe he would be able to see this. The great commission that contains the authority to baptize was to last to the end of the world, and the baptism of that commission was water baptism, because it was performed by the apostles, and it was in the name of the Father, the Son, and Holy Spirit. The apostles did not baptize with the Holy Spirit; only the

Father did this. It is therefore certain* that the one baptism of which the apostle speaks is water baptism.

Mr. Thrift argues still further with the apostle over what he said about "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," in these words: "But the immersionist is still unsatisfied. He says: 'Why do you have more than one, when the Bible says there is 'one Lord, one faith, one baptism?' (Eph. 4: 5.)" Sure enough, and why do you? I think I can tell you why you do. In Paul's day there was but one baptism, and it was an act which people did. The act consisted, according to Paul, in a burial. The Roman Catholics, on the authority of the Pope, changed that act to sprinkling or pouring. No Catholic in that day believed that the Bible taught sprinkling and pouring for baptism; but the Pope of Rome, being infallible, had the right to change it. Pedobaptists inherited it, so to speak, from the Roman Catholics and are now trying to prove it by the Bible. The leaders really believe there is nothing in baptism, anyway; and if they can keep their members who have some conscience on the subject satisfied by making a show of an argument from the Bible, it is perfectly all right to do so. I think, though, that it is possible that Mr. Thrift, with his turn of mind, has been convinced that the Bible in some way teaches sprinkling and pouring for baptism; but I doubt whether he is entirely satisfied with his effort in arguing against the apostle as he does on this passage and the sixth chapter of Romans.

THE MEANING OF "BAPTIZO."

Under the above caption Mr. Thrift says: "But in classical Greek does not 'baptizo' mean 'immerse' always? No, it means to wet, moisten, bedew; to rain, to spill (gases)." Any man who will endeavor to make his readers believe that the above is the primary meaning of the word "baptizo" is either lacking in candor or information. The word means to wet, to moisten, sometimes, only because a thing that is immersed or submerged in water is *wet* or moistened.

The gentleman pretends to quote Sophocles, and this is

the way he quotes him: "'To dip, to immerse, to sink, to bathe' (bathing was by affusion rather than by immersion), 'to baptize.'" It will be noted that the parenthetical clause, "bathing was by affusion rather than by immersion," was thrown in by Mr. Thrift in the midst of the quotation. A man that would treat a definition that way is not trying to learn the meaning of the word, but he is trying to cover up that meaning. If this is Methodism, I must say it differs from Christianity at this point.

Mr. Thrift quotes from the great Thayer, who has given to the world the greatest New Testament lexicon extant, and disposes of him in the following words: "'To dip, to immerse, to submerge, to cleanse, to wash, to bathe; in the New Testament, an immersion in water, performed as a sign of the removal of sin.' (Thayer.) This last statement is diametrically opposed to the Scriptures. The Israelites were baptized when crossing the Red Sea by pouring. (See page 7.) The baptism of the Holy Ghost was certainly not immersion in water. We must give up Thayer or the Bible. I give up Thayer." Certainly you give up Thayer, and you give up every other lexicon, and you give up the Bible also. All this you give up simply to follow after the lead of the Pope of Rome, who changed the act of baptism on the claim that he was infallible.

I will give the definition of some of the best lexicons:

Bagster: "'Baptizo,' to dip, immerse; to cleanse or purify by washing; to administer the rite of baptism; to baptize."

Bass: "'Baptizo,' to dip, immerse, or plunge in water."

Green: "'Baptizo,' to dip, immerse; to cleanse or purify by washing; to administer the rite of baptism; to baptize."

Groves: "'Baptizo,' to dip, immerse, immerge, plunge; to wash, cleanse, purify; to baptize."

Liddell and Scott: "'Baptizo,' to dip in or under water; of ships, to sink or disable them."

Parkhurst: "'Baptizo,' from 'bapto,' to dip; to dip, immerse, or plunge in water."

Pickering: "'Baptizo,' to dip, immerse, submerge,

plunge, sink, overwhelm; to steep, to soak, to wet; mid., to wash one's self, or bathe."

Robinson: "'Baptizo,' to immerse, to sink. (1) To wash, to cleanse by washing."

Sophocles: "'Baptizo,' to dip, to immerse; to sink."

It will be noted that Mr. Thrift, in order to break the force of the definition, added by way of parenthesis that "bathing was by affusion rather than by immersion." I hope the gentleman does not practice what he preaches when he takes his daily or weekly bath. From the above quotations from the lexicons, the gentleman will have to give up, not only Thayer, but every standard lexicon in the world.

On the definition of "baptizo," Mr. Thrift will also have to give up the best church historians that the world has.

Mosheim says: "The sacrament of baptism was administered in this century, without the public assemblies, in places appointed and prepared for that purpose, and was performed by an immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font." ("Ecclesiastical History," Century I., Part II., Chapter IV., page 28.)

Neander: "In respect to the form of baptism, it was in conformity with the original institution and the original import of the symbol, performed by immersion, as a sign of the entire baptism in the Holy Spirit, of being entirely penetrated by the same." ("Church History," Volume I., page 422.)

Stanley: "Baptism was not only a bath, but a plunge—an entire submersion in the deep water, a leap as into the rolling sea or the rushing river, when for the moment the waves close over the bather's head, and he emerges again as from a momentary grave; or it was the shock of a shower bath—the rush of water passed over the whole person from capacious vessels, so as to wrap the recipient as within the veil of a splashing cataract." ("Baptism," in the Nineteenth Century, October, 1879, page 689.)

Wall: "Their general and ordinary way was to baptize by immersion, or dipping the person, whether it were an infant or grown man or woman, into the water. This 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 also we ought to disown and show a dislike of the profane scoffs which some people give to the English antipedobaptists merely for their use of dipping." ("History of Infant Baptism," Volume I., page 570.)

Mr. Thrift will have to give up the church historians along with Thayer. Luther will have to go also, as he said: "The term 'baptism' is a Greek word; it may be rendered into Latin by *mersio*: when we immerse anything in water, that it may be entirely covered with water. And though that custom be quite abolished among the generality (for neither do they entirely dip children, but only sprinkle them with a little water), nevertheless they ought to be wholly immersed, and immediately to be drawn out again, for the etymology of the word seems to require it." ("Opera," Tom. I., page 72.)

Is Mr. Thrift prepared to give up all this authority on the meaning of the word along with Thayer and the Bible? I am sure that the original word means to dip or immerse, but it has been changed for convenience by those who, like Mr. Thrift, attach no importance to the command to be baptized. If the original word means to sprinkle, as Mr. Thrift argues in his pamphlet, why was it ever changed to immersion? Man is not inclined to change from an easy way to a more difficult one, but he is inclined to change from a difficult way to an easy way. This is exactly what was done, and now Mr. Thrift is trying to prove that the word originally meant to sprinkle. There is no reason, no authority, and no Scripture for the gentleman's contention. It is based wholly on his desire that it should be so. Let us all look the issue squarely in the face and accept the facts that are plainly taught in the word of God and that are supported by the scholarship of all ages.

