

Abilene Christian University

Digital Commons @ ACU

Stone-Campbell Books

Stone-Campbell Resources

1935

An Exposure of an Unfortunate Man

Daniel Sommer

H. C. Harper

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 [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sommer, Daniel and Harper, H. C., "An Exposure of an Unfortunate Man" (1935). *Stone-Campbell Books*. 348.

https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/crs_books/348

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.

HARPER ~ SOMMER
DEBATE



AN EXPOSURE. of an UNFORTUNATE MAN

Introductory

Many years ago I wrote and published a tract titled "Religious Sectism; Defined, Analyzed and Exposed." Beginning on the 24th page of that tract I offered the following in regard to the Greek preposition **eis**, as it is connected with the word "baptism" in the New Testament:

What do Greek lexicons or dictionaries say about the preposition **eis** which is used in Acts 2: 38, in regard to its meanings or shades of meaning? A Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament revised "by Thomas Sheldon Green, M. A." defines **eis** thus: "into, to, as far as, to the extent of, until, before in the presence of, in order to, for, with a view to, for the use or service of, in accordance with." Another which is in connection with the Greek text by Greenfield defines **eis** thus: "On, into, upon, in, among, to, towards, upon, near to, by, towards, against, to, even to, until to, for," etc. Groves gives as a definition of the word **eis**: In, into; to, unto, until; among, at, before, in presence of; at, on, upon; towards, against; as to, in respect of, concerning; through, by; for, for to, in order to, to the end that, so that. Liddell and Scott say that the chief signification of **eis** is **into**. According to these definitions it is evident that the idea of purpose or design is not among either primary nor even secondary meanings of the Greek preposition **eis**. That idea is not in the first shade of the meaning of that preposition in any Greek dictionary that we have ever seen, and very few give the idea of purpose even as a secondary meaning. Divine commands are generally, if not always, given in the primary meanings of words.

Still, as it sometimes has the meaning of design or purpose, the question arises, Has it not that meaning in Acts 2nd chapter and 38th verse? In answer to this question an illustration should be given. A teacher of Greek has a pupil named John who is studying the New Testament. That teacher has often taught his pupil that the primary meaning of words must always be chosen in making a translation unless the sense of the sentence forbids. With this good rule well impressed he tells John to write on the blackboard all sentences of Scripture in which **eis** is found in connection with the word **baptism**, but to leave the preposition **eis** untranslated. In obedience to his teacher John writes a part of Matt. 3: 11, "I indeed baptize you with water **eis** repentance." Then he writes Matt. 28: 19, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them **eis** the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." Next he writes Mark 1: 4, "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance **eis** remission of sins." Next he writes Luke 3: 3, "And he came into all the country about Jordan preaching the baptism of repentance **eis** remission of sins." Then John writes Acts 2: 38, "Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, **eis** remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Then he writes Acts 19: 5, "When they heard this they were baptized **eis** the name of the Lord Jesus." Next he writes Rom. 6: 3, 4, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized **eis** Jesus Christ were baptized **eis** his death; therefore we are buried with Christ by baptism **eis** death." Then John writes 1 Cor. 10: 2, "And were all baptized **eis** Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Finally John writes Gal. 3: 27, "For as many of you as have been baptized **eis** Christ have

put on Christ." The teacher **then** tells John to make a consistent translation of the prepositions **eis** in all those passages of the Sacred Text. Remembering what his teacher has taught him about taking the primary meaning of a word whenever it will make sense, John looks at his Greek dictionary and after assuring himself that **into** is one of the first and radical meanings of **eis**, and taking **into** as the meaning, he translates every passage placed on the black board, and makes good sense and good strength in each instance. Matt. 3: 11 he translates, "I indeed baptize you with [in] water **into** repentance"; Matt. 28: 19, "baptizing them **into** the name of the Father," etc.; Mark 1: 4, "and preach the baptism of repentance **into** remission of sins"; Luke 3: 3, "preaching the baptism of repentance **into** remission of sins"; Acts 2: 38, "every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ **into** remission of sins"; Acts 19: 5, "they were baptized **into** the name of the Lord Jesus"; Rom. 6: 3, 4, "were baptized **into** Jesus Christ were baptized **into** his death"; 1 Cor. 10: 2, "and were all baptized **into** Moses"; Gal. 3: 27, "baptized **into** Christ have put on Christ." The teacher then tells John to try the meaning **unto** as a translation of **eis**. He makes the attempt but gets into some trouble with Matt. 3: 11, as the word **unto** in that passage is too weak. Then he gets into worse trouble in Matt. 28: 19. In Rom. 6: 3, 4 John is entirely unsatisfied, while in 1 Cor. 10: 2 and Gal. 3: 27 he feels that he has a weak translation. The teacher then tells John to try the translation **for** or **in order to**. John proceeds, and is not satisfied with his success in Matt. 3: 11. The idea that John baptized people **for** or **in order to** repentance, does not strike him favorably. With Mark 1: 2 and Luke 3: 3 he does better. But when he comes to Matt. 28: 19 he is confused, and says to his teacher that "something is wrong," as the command "baptizing them" **for** or **in order to** "the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" is **nonsense**. To this the teacher agrees, and John passes to Acts 2: 38 and makes sense by using the words **for** or **in order to**. Then he passes to Rom. 6: 3, 4, and by using **for** or **in order to** as the translation of **eis** he again makes **nonsense**. The idea of being "baptized" **for** "Jesus Christ" or **in order to** "Jesus Christ," and **for** or **in order to** "his death," and "buried with him by baptism" **for** or **in order to** death—this is so absurd that John and his teacher both laugh. Then 1 Cor. 10: 2 is considered, and the idea that the Israelites were baptized **for** or **in order to** Moses provokes more laughter. Finally, John refers to Gal. 3: 27, and there shakes his head, saying, "The idea that Paul said that as many as had been baptized **for** or **in order to** Christ had 'put on Christ,' does not sound to me like common sense, to say nothing about divine inspiration." To this the teacher assents, but tells John that **theological custom** requires that Acts 2: 38 shall be translated by **for** or **in order to** as the meaning of **eis** in that passage. John answers by saying, "That makes me think just that much less of theological customs, for there is not a shadow of reason for ignoring the primary meaning of the word **eis** in this passage, nor for making an inconsistent translation which no man can defend." To this answer John's teacher makes no reply.

H C Harper, an editor of a paper named "The Apostolic Way," has pretended to review and expose the tract in which the foregoing paragraphs appear, in a pamphlet of 24 pages, and this is his manner of procedure after offering a scurrilous "Preface" by A. McGary:

FOREWORD

In the **Apostolic Review** of March 6, 1917, Daniel Sommer says: "An inquirer whose name is not before me wishes some information about **re-baptism**. He should send for a tract on **SECTARIANISM**, offered for sale in the A. R. office, and read it carefully. (Price 10 cents). In it he will find the question of **re-baptism** considered carefully."

I have read this tract "carefully." And after reading it one would judge that it was written by some sectarian who was trying to pervert or evade the truth.

Bro. Sommer seems to brand every man that crosses his path on any subject a **hobbyist**. I counted more than a hundred of his uses of this word in some of its forms in this tract. It is becoming common, it seems, with writers who find a position they cannot overthrow, forthwith to cry out, "A hobby! A hobby!" But I never let the bugbear hobby frighten me from the truth; and I intend to examine what Bro. Sommer says in his tract on what he calls "the question of re-baptism."

Of course he will not object to this; and he will be ready to investigate this matter with an opponent; for certainly he is not one of these **hobbyists**, who he says "have become enthusiasts, if not fanatics, over theories and practices which they are painfully aware will not bear a scriptural investigation with a well-informed opponent." Of course he is not one of the craven **hobbyists**, for he says: "Therefore they avoid such an investigation wherever possible, and endeavor to advocate their peculiar views among those incapable of detecting and exposing their false reasoning." Of course Bro. Sommer is not this low; neither is he one of the "bluff and swagger" kind to whom he calls our attention. He is ready, he says, to "affirm every statement that he ever made on the question in controversy."

Enough said! Now let him face the music. The Author.

To this he adds on the 5th page of his pamphlet concerning me,

Again he says: "Still, as it [eis] sometimes has the meaning of design or purpose, the question arises, Has it that meaning in Acts 2nd chapter and 38th verse?" He answers this question by putting himself up as "a teacher of Greek" with "a pupil named John who is studying the New Testament," and finally "tells John that **theological custom** requires that Acts 2: 38 shall be translated by **for**, or **in order to** as the meaning of **eis** in that passage."

And this is all that H. C. Harper permitted his readers to see of what I wrote about John as a student of the Greek New Testament! If I would judge Harper by such procedure in order to besmirch me in regard to the meaning of **eis** in Acts 2: 38, I might justly decide that he has not an honest bone in his body, nor a drop of honest blood in his veins, nor that he is capable of thinking an honest thought, nor breathing an honest breath. But instead of thus deciding I shall charitably suppose that he is a respectable sort of a man, except when he is insane with hatred for certain errors, real or imaginary, in certain sectarian doctrines. Or he is like the Elder I heard of, who was pronounced "a very good sort of a man, except that he was inclined to be a trifle quarrelsome when he was drunk."

I intend in my next article to copy Harper's first chapter in his pamphlet and expose it and its author as both deserve to be exposed.

Chapter I

My tract on "Sectism" was strictly impersonal. I did not designate any one by name in it, and tried to avoid all personalities while writing it. On the contrary I wrote questions, answers and remarks concerning certain subjects that pertained to religious sectism. Instead of H. C. Harper following my example in these respects, I think he wrote the most **offensively personal pamphlet** that he could write without resort to vulgarity and profanity. He certainly made a free use of slang and ridicule. His pamphlet is strictly a **scurrilous document**, and should cause his friends to admonish him never again to adopt that style of writing. Here is his first chapter:

(THE "REVIEW" AND BAPTISM)

Bro. Sommer turns his batteries on Acts 2: 38; but like the sects he here goes down in utter defeat. He is, as the old saying goes, "as helpless as a hog on ice;" for as Dr. Willmarth (Baptist) truly says: "Whoever carries the weight of our [Baptist] controversy with the Campbellites [He means Christians] upon the **eis** [i-e-e] will break through—there is no footing there for the evolutions of the theological skater." (Baptist Quarterly, July 1877.)

Now watch Sommer go down. He says: "In Matt. 26: 28 the translation 'for remission of sins' is certainly correct." "But", he says, "should we admit that the word 'for' in Acts 2: 38 means **design**?" And he answers, "No".

Again he says: "Still, as it sometimes has the meaning of design or purpose, the question arises, Has it that meaning in Acts 2nd chapter and 38th verse?"

He answers this question by putting himself up as "a teacher of Greek" with "a pupil named John who is studying the New Testament," and finally "tells John that **theological custom** requires that Acts 2: 38 shall be translated by **for** or **in order** to as the meaning of **eis** in that passage".

Theological custom, indeed! The man who makes such a statement as Bro. Sommer here does, should be slow to speak of others as those who "should **feel ashamed to live** and be **afraid to die**." Indeed, he should. If it were a question of but little importance, we might bear with such treatment of it; but a question that concerns the eternal welfare of precious souls should be given **fair** treatment, at least.

Where is the man of Bro. Sommer's ability who does not know that when **eis** in Acts 2: 38 is translated "**for** or **in order** to" the meaning is just the opposite from that for which "theological custom" clamors? For as Bro. F. W. Smith truly says:

"The meaning and force of the preposition **eis** in the sentence under consideration has been too well established by the ripest scholarship of the world for any one at this late date to call it in question. All who are entitled to respectability as scholars translate the passage in a way to leave no room to doubt that baptism is **in order to** the remission of sins."

Let the candid reader carefully examine the following:

Harkness, Professor of Greek, Brown University, says: "In my opinion **eis** in Acts 2: 38 denotes **purpose** and may be rendered **in order to**, or **for the purpose of receiving**, or as in our English version **for: Eis aphesin hamartion** [for the remission of sins] suggests the motive or object contemplated in the action of the two preceding verbs."

Strong, Drew Seminary, says: "**Eis** in Acts 2: 38, can only have its natural and **causal** force of **in order to**, as the design and result of the act on the part of those addressed."

Paine, Bangor Seminary, says: "**Eis** in Acts 2: 38 means **in order to** or **with a view to** the remission of sins; but it is to be connected with both the preceding verbs, **repent** and **be baptized**."

Hogue, Washington and Lee University, says: "I should translate **eis** in Acts 2: 38 by **for**, i. e., **with a view to**. The connection established by **eis** between **repent** and **be baptized** I take to be a relation of purpose, as if he had said: to the end that your sins might be forgiven."

Goodwin, Harvard University, says: "I think **eis** in Acts 2: 38 expresses **purpose** or **tendency** and is rightly translated **for** or **unto** (in the sense of **for**)."

Harper, Chicago University, says: "The preposition **eis** is to be translated **unto**, i. e., **in order to secure**. The preposition indicates that **remission of sins** is the **end** to be aimed at in the actions expressed by the preceding predicates **repent** and **be baptized**."

Hackett, Newton Theological Institution, translates **eis** in Acts 2: 38 "in order to," and says: "**In order to the forgiveness of sins** we connect naturally with both the preceding verbs. This clause states the motive or object which should induce them to repent and be baptized."

D'Ooge, University of Michigan, says: "In my judgment

the preposition **eis** in the verse referred to expresses the relation of **aim** or **end** in view, answering the question **eis te** (for what?), and is to be translated by **unto, in order to, for.**"

Bywater, Oxford University, England, says: "The preposition **eis** in Acts 2: 38 expresses the **end** or **purpose** to be attained: compare Moulton's 'Winer', ed. 3, p. 495, and Thayer's 'Grimm', p. 185. The translation, I suppose, is **with a view to** the remission of your sins, or **to the end that your sins may be remitted.**"

Doddridge, in **Family Expositor**, says: "They are not only called here to **repent**, a submission also to the ordinance of baptism is required of them, **in order to** the forgiveness of their sins."

Flagg, Cornell University, says: "The preposition **eis** in Acts 2: 38, I should say denotes **intention** or **purpose**: **with a view to**, much as if it had been written **so as to obtain** the remission of sins."

Peppler, Emery College, Ga., says: "The expression **for the remission of sins** in Acts 2: 38 means **in order to obtain** the remission of sins. The translation of the Authorized Version of the Bible very well represents the meaning of the original of Acts 2: 38, provided one adds that **for** expresses **purpose**, that is, **in order to get** the forgiveness of your sins."

Goodell, Yale University, says: "With regard to the preposition **eis** in Acts 2: 38 I do not know that I can do better than quote the rendering in Thayer's Lexicon to the New Testament under **eis**, namely, **to obtain the forgiveness of sins.**"

Harmon, Dickinson College, says: "I would say that **eis** in Acts 2: 38 has the force of **for**, the object to be obtained, to the end that. I would thus translate the passage: **Repent, and let each one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for (that ye may obtain) the remission of your sins.**"

Huntington, Columbia University, says: "In Acts 2: 38 **eis** undoubtedly means, as I am compelled to think, **for the purpose of receiving, in order that you may receive**, etc. It is connected with both the preceding verbs."

McLintock, Drew Seminary, says: "In these cases, Matt. 28: 19; Rom. 6: 3; 1 Cor. 10: 2; 1 Cor. 12: 13; Acts 2: 38, **eis** retains its proper significance, as indicating the **terminus ad quem**, and tropically, that **for** which, or **with a view to** which, the thing is done. . . . To be baptized **for** the remission of sins means to be baptized **with a view to receiving** this."

Sitterly, Drew Seminary, says: "The preposition **eis** in Acts 2: 38 may be translated **for, unto, and in order to**. In the clause **for the remission of sins** Peter states the reason or motive that should induce to repentance and baptism, referring not to one but to both verbs preceding. According to Winer 549, c. **eis** is here used tropically to denote the purpose or end in view."

Willmarth, well-known Baptist scholar, says: "We conclude without hesitation, and in accordance with such authorities as Mackett, Winer, Meyer, etc., that the proper rendering of **eis** **aphesin hamartion** in Acts 2: 38, as in Matt. 26: 28, is **unto, for**, i. e., **IN ORDER TO**, remission of sins."

Again he says: "In answer to earnest inquiry Peter points out a course of action which will tend towards, and result in, the forgiveness which they desire; he directs them to take that course for that purpose."

Again he says: "When Campbellites [he means Christians] translate **in order to** in Acts 2: 38, they translate correctly."

Again he says: "Shall we gain anything by maintaining a false translation and allowing the Campbellites [Christians] to be champions of the true, with the world's scholarship on their side?" (**Baptist Quarterly**, July, 1877.)

McGarvey, Lexington University, says: "Peter's purpose in the expression **for the remission of sins** was not to indicate the mere fact that baptism brings one to remission, but to state the blessing in order to the attainment of which his hearers were to be baptized. In other words, he states a motive for the act."

Again he says: "It makes it doubly certain that remission of

lack of thoroughness, and even shows haste in regard to an important subject.

Chapter II

I now offer to my readers the 2nd chapter of H. C. Harper's attack on me in regard to the proper translation of **eis** in Acts 2: 38.

CHAPTER II

Now watch Brother Sommer as he tries in vain to save himself from his headlong tumble upon the **eis**.

He says: "But it need only to be stated in order to be understood and admitted that the word **design** implies a **designer**, and thus if there be any **design** connected with baptism it refers to Christ's **design** in giving it as a command to be obeyed. Therefore whatever purpose or **design** Christ had in commanding believers to be baptized it all belongs to the **divine** side, and not the **human** side of the great plan of salvation."

It would not do to call this sophistry—it is too soft.

"Truly, the word **design** implies a **designer**; and **thinking** implies a **thinker**. And it does not take much thinking in this case to see that the word **eis** expresses that which belongs to the **human** side of the great plan of salvation. All you need is sense enough to read; for Peter commanded **them**, not Christ, to repent and be baptized (**eis**) **for**, or **in order to**, the remission of sins. Hence whatever **eis** expresses it positively belongs to them, the **believers**, to whom the command was addressed. And no amount of twisting can evade it.

And Benjamin Franklin, who once edited the Review, truly says:

"The Divine Spirit, Acts 2: 38, connected both repentance and immersion in the same sentence, in view of the same thing—**remission of sins**. He commanded believers to 'Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ **for** the remission of sins.' The same words here that tell us what the repentance is **for**, or **in order to**, or what men are to have in view of repenting, tell us also what they are to have in view of being immersed. Not only the same words, but in the **same sentence**, tell us what is in view in both repenting and being immersed. They are both in view of the same thing—remission of sins. The object the sinner has, the seeker, or subject is remission of sins. He repents and is immersed in view of this object." (*The Gospel Preacher*, Vol. 11., p. 135.)

Dare Sommer deny this? It is God's truth, and he surely cannot overthrow it. As Dr. Willmarth says, there is "no footing" here for him.

J. W. McGarvey says: "Peter's purpose in the expression—**for** remission of sins—was not to indicate the mere fact that baptism brings one to remission, but to state the blessing in order to the attainment of which his hearers were to be baptized. In other words, he states a motive for the act." (*New Com. on Acts*.)

Again he says: "The people were told to repent and be baptized 'for the remission of sins'. This is only stating more specifically what would have been understood from connecting the question with its answer, as we have just said. It makes it doubly certain that remission of sins follows baptism, and is therefore to be expected by the baptized." (*Ibid.*)

Campbell says, "In the first place, then, no one is commanded to be baptized **for anything else**, and no one is ever said to have been baptized **for anything else**, than for the remission of sins."

Again he says: "Evident, then, it is, that there is no **specific design** on account of which any one can constitutionally be baptized, except it be for the remission of sins previously committed." (*Campbell on Baptism*.)

Dr. Willmarth says: "Everything unites to render a mistake as to the force of **eis** almost impossible. Everything compels us to assign to it its obvious, natural, distinctive meaning, as

used to denote the purpose of action. It here marks the purpose for which, the object in order to which, the inquirers of Pentecost were to repent and be baptized."

Again he says: "Peter points out a course of action which will tend towards, and result in, the forgiveness which they desire. He directs them to take that course for that purpose." (*Baptist Quarterly*, July 1877.)

M. C. Kurfrees says: "'Repent, and be baptized unto the remission of sins' means do both, of course, 'unto the remission of sins.' What else could it mean?" (G. A., Sept. 3, 1914.)

Hackett says: "This clause (for the remission of sins) states the motive or object which should induce them to repent and be baptized."

McLintoek says: "To be baptized **for** the remission of sins means to be baptized **with a view to receiving** this."

Wm. R. Harper says: "The preposition (**eis**) indicates that **remission of sins** is the end to be aimed at in the actions expressed by the predicates **repent** and **be baptized**."

Strong says: "**Eis** in Acts 2: 38 can only have its natural and causal force of **in order to**, as the design and result of the act on the part of those addressed."

Now if Sommer is not flat on the **eis**, where is he? He kicks and squirms, but he is down to stay.

MY REMARKS

1. Let the reader notice the expressions "headlong tumble," "too soft," "twisting," "flat on the **eis**," also "he kicks and squirms," and then ask whether a Christian, or a gentleman, or even a manly man, would thus write concerning any one, especially any one that he designates as "brother".

2. All of the writers he copied from in the foregoing paragraphs were writing against those that did not regard baptism as essential in any sense to the alien sinners' salvation, and probably all of them were willing to acknowledge every one as scripturally baptized who has sincerely submitted to single immersion in the name of the Godhead.

3. Not one of those writers had, perhaps, ever come in contact with those disciples that act the part of sectarians by sitting in judgment on the sinner's mental condition at the time of his baptism.

4. The expression "design of Baptism" is not in the Bible, and is like the expression "getting religion." Neither of those expressions is authorized by the Sacred Text, and the question: "Did you understand **the design of baptism**?" is as unauthorized as, "Did you feel happy **when you got religion**?"

5. Not one of the writers that Harper copied from in the foregoing paragraphs ever tried to make a consistent translation of the Greek preposition **eis** when used in connection with the word "baptism," as far as we are informed of them, and thus never learned by other scriptures that the word "for" is not the proper translation of **eis** in Acts 2: 38. Reader, turn back and read what a student of the Greek New Testament, called John, really set forth on that subject. All those writers that Harper has arrayed against John as a student of Greek are somewhat like soldiers arrayed in an open space against a man who has a machine gun in a well-protected place with a fair sweep over that open space. He has the advantage to such an extent and degree that those soldiers, however good they may be, are destined to be slaughtered. Thus in this instance John was and is so well protected and is so well armed by his consistent translation that Harper's entire array of men is only that they may be confuted, and thus **theologically slaughtered**.

6. In a preceding article H C Harper ridiculed the statement

of John's teacher, that "Theological custom required that Acts 2: 38 shall be translated by **for** or **in order to** as the meaning of **eis** in that passage." Then he unintentionally proceeded to condemn his own ridicule and prove John's teacher's statement true by copying from **all the theologians** within his reach. Notice his use of Hackett and Sitterly of "Newton Theological Institution," McLintock of "Drew Seminary," also many others. Harper, I again say, first ridiculed my report of John's teacher declaring that "theological custom" required a certain translation of Acts 2: 38, and then **condemned his effort at ridicule** by copying from theologians, even teachers in **theological seminaries**, in order to prove his preferred translation. Thus he **copied from theologians to prove a theological custom**, and, as the old illustration states, "He sawed off the limb on which he attempted to stand."

Harper declares, "Campbell says: 'In the first place, then, no one is commanded to be baptized **for anything else**, and no one is ever said to be have been baptized **for anything** else than for the remission of sins'." I now deny this statement and proceed **to prove it false**, even if Campbell did make it, and even if I could admit that the word **for**, or **in order to**, is a proper translation when used in Acts 2: 38, **which I do not admit**.

1. We are baptized **in order to** be "born of water," and this means more than "remission of sins." John 3: 5.

2. We are baptized **in order to** be brought "into the name" of the Godhead, and this means more than "the remission of sins." Matt. 28: 19.

3. We are baptized **in order to** be brought "into the death of Christ," also in order that we may be "buried with him," and raised to "walk in newness of life"; and this means more than "the remission of sins." Rom. 6: 34.

4. We are baptized **in order to** "put on Christ," and that means more than "the remission of sins." Gal. 3: 27.

5. We are baptized **in order to** have the answer of "a good conscience toward God," and this means more than "the remission of sins." 1 Peter 3: 21.

Having thus proved Campbell's alleged statement untrue, I have proved its advocate to be an endorser of an untruth, and this means that he is an endorser of a **falsehood**. But H C Harper seems willing to advocate and endorse anything in order to "down Sommer." And as the Greek preposition **eis** is found in each of the scriptures cited in four of the five preceding paragraphs, I shall try Harper's dearly-beloved translation of that preposition, as advocated by him and endorsed by the "theological custom" of his theological friends, including certain professors in certain theological seminaries.

1. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter [eis—**for**] the kingdom of heaven."

2. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them [eis—**for**] the name of the Father and the Son and of the Holy Spirit."

3. "As many of you as have been baptized [eis—**for**] Christ have put on Christ."

4. "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism [eis—**for**] death."

How does H C Harper like his dearly-beloved translation in other scriptures besides Acts 2: 38, at which special scripture

he seems disposed to look as a dog looks at his dinner, or as a man looks through a gimlet hole!

Here I notice that Harper copies from M C Kurfees, probably the best scholar to whom he refers, and that Kurfees uses the word "unto" instead of "for," and as the word **unto** means **transition** rather than **purpose** it is very near the truth. But the word "into" is the only word for a consistent translation of **eis** in all instances where it is connected with the word baptism. A student of Greek named John made a consistent translation of **eis** as thus connected, and H C Harper had not the courage, the manhood, the honesty, the fairness, the candor, to let his readers see what John said.

This Harper may be a very respectable sort of a man when not "exceedingly mad" against certain sectarian errors, and especially against those disciples that will not become as "mad" as he is, and therefore will not adopt his unscriptural extremes in denouncing them, nor the errors of his theological-seminary friends in defending those extremes, but when he is mad he is a fright.

Chapter III

I now offer to my readers the third chapter of Harper's pamphlet against me. I say "against me," for he has begun each chapter of the mentioned pamphlet by disrespectful mention of me, and thus he has ended each chapter. I never saw a more determined effort to crush a man than he has made to crush me—before his readers. Yet he persists in designating me as "Bro. Sommer." I am reminded of Prov. 10: 18, also Isa. 44: 20.

CHAPTER III

Bro. Sommer still struggles to get up, but all to no avail.

He says: "In view of the fact that Christ's blood was shed to **make an atonement for sins**, while water baptism is **in no sense** for an atonement, is it not dangerous to translate Acts 2: 38 by the same form of expression that is used in Matt. 26th chapter and 28th verse?"

And he answers: "Yes, because by so doing the impression may be made that the blood of Christ and water baptism are for the same purpose."

Then he concludes, saying: "All who consider such differences honestly will doubtless see the reason why Matt. 26: 28 should not be permitted to control Acts 2: 38 in regard to translation."

And this nonsense is from the man who talks of "**exposing the false reasoning**" of others! And it certainly is the best he can do.

As a matter of fact, Matt. 26: 28 never has controlled Acts 2: 38 in translation any more than Acts 2: 38 has controlled Matt. 26: 28. Each passage is translated on its own merits; but it seems that Bro. Sommer can do **better** (for his theory, of course) in making a **translation from the original** than the Holy Spirit, the Lord Jesus Christ, and God Almighty combined, could do in **giving the original**!

The **original** is certainly "dangerous" if there is a shadow of truth in the reasoning of Bro. Sommer, because "the same form of expression"—**eis aphesin hamartion**—is used in both passages, even "in view of the fact that Christ's blood was shed to **make an atonement for sins**, while water baptism is **in no sense** for an atonement." Yes, sir; and dare Bro. Sommer, or any other man in his sane mind, say that God did not "consider such differences honestly"? Just tell us, please!

Bro. W G Roberts gives the truth when he says, in speaking of Matt. 26: 28: "The word 'for' is from the Greek **eis**, and means

'with a view to, in order to,' etc.; it is the same word and meaning as found in Acts 2: 38.'" (Forty Reasons Why I Am Not a Baptist.)

Exactly so; and L S White, in his debate with Russell at Cincinnati, could say without the slightest fear of successful contradiction: "We have in Greek a prepositional phrase, **eis aphesis hamartion**, that occurs three times in the New Testament: Matt. 26: 28; Luke 3: 3; Acts 2: 38. The English phrase that is translated from that Greek phrase is **for the remission of sins**. The scholarship of the world tells us that it is identically the same, both in Greek and English."

And Sommer is still down with the Baptists and all other sectarians!

But he struggles again to regain his footing. He says: "But what shall we say to those who inform us that in Matt. 26: 28 the same form of expression is used as is found in Acts 2: 38, and that in Matt. 26: 28 the translation 'for the remission of sins' is certainly correct? We should tell them yes, but every form of expression as well as every word is known by the **company or connection** in which it is found, and this makes the difference between Matt. 26: 28 and Acts 2: 38."

But who that has sense enough to keep out of the fire does not know that when both passages are **translated** into English "by the same form of expression," the English reader finds the same "**company or connection**" that the Greek reader finds in both passages when he reads "the same form of expression" in both, as God gave it in the **original**?

Is Bro. Sommer trying to help God Almighty out of a tight place? Can he make it plainer than God could give it in the **original**? Bro. Sommer may be great, but I, for one, am not willing to acknowledge that he is wiser than God Almighty.

Now, while the "same form of expression" in both passages does not suit the theory of Bro. Sommer and the sectarian world, it evidently suits the Lord and "the scholarship of the world." And Bro. Sommer's "strong argument," as he calls it (I call it **presumption** pure and simple), is seen to be nothing but a weak effort to evade the truth. Surely, any sectarian perverter could do as well for his theory.

Bro. Sommer continues to flounder on the **eis**. He calls our attention to what Campbell said in his debate with Rice; but Campbell utterly fails him. He says:

"Did Alexander Campbell admit that the translation 'into remission of sins' is correct? Yes. On the 494th page of the Campbell and Rice Debate we find the following:

"They were baptized **into** Moses or **unto** Moses, **into** Christ, **into** his death, **into** John's baptism; and, if any one prefer it, **into** repentance, **into** remission of sins, **into** one body, etc. In every instance there is a **transition** from one state, profession, or place, into another. The person has suffered an immersion for something into the possession or enjoyment of which he now enters, or enters into more fully than before'."

You will observe, gentle reader, that Campbell here says: "And, if any one prefer it," etc. Campbell did not say that he preferred it, neither did he say it is correct. But Campbell here shows that even admitting this to be a tolerable rendering, for argument's sake, Mr. Rice is by it defeated.

Now to get what Campbell admits to be "correct," we turn to his work—Campbell on Baptism, p. 251—and find that he translates **eis** in Acts 2: 38 "in order to." And he endorses this translation as "correct" in THE LIVING ORACLES.

Moreover, he says: "Were it not for an imaginary incongruity between the means and the end, or the thing done and the alleged purpose or result, no one could, for one moment, doubt that the design of baptism was for 'the remission of sins'."

And in a note to this he says: "The preposition **eis** translated for in this connection of means and designs is often so translated; and might have been hundreds of times much better so translated in the common version of the New Testament, than by **in** by **into** or **unto**, or **to**."

Now any one can see that Bro. Sommer has utterly failed to make good as to what he says Campbell admits is "correct." In

fact it is plainly seen that the **eis** trips Sommer as completely as it did Mr. Rice. For Peter's reply on this occasion, together with the question, "Brethren, what shall we do?" as McGarvey well says: "makes it doubly certain that **remission of sins** FOLLOWS baptism, and is therefore to be expected by the baptized." Or as Franklin truly says: "He (Peter) commanded believers to 'Repent, and be immersed every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.' The same words here that tell us what the repentance is for, or in order to, or what men are to have in view of repenting, tell us also what they are to have in view of being immersed. Not only the same words, but in the **same sentence**, tell us what is in view in both repenting and being immersed. They are both in view of the same thing—remission of sins. The object the sinner has, the seeker, or subject, is remission of sins. He repents and is immersed in view of this object." Or as Campbell says: "Baptism has both a meaning and a design. It must be received in that meaning and for that design, else it is another baptism and not the one commanded by Christ and practiced by his holy apostles." Again he says: "Evident, then, it is, that there is no **specific design** on account of which any one can constitutionally be baptized, except it be for the remission of sins previously committed." And he further says: "No one is commanded to be baptized **for anything else**, and no one is ever said to have been baptized **for anything else**, than for the remission of sins."

And sommer is still floundering on the **eis**, unable to get up.

MY REMARKS

1. One of the most common and flippant remarks made concerning Acts 2: 38 is that the Greek preposition **eis** in Matt. 26: 28 is there translated by the word "for," and that because that preposition is there translated correctly by the word "for," therefore it should be thus translated in Acts 2: 38. But Harper says, "Each passage is translated on its own merits." Yet in order to reproach me to the limit he added, "but it seems that Bro. Sommer can do **better** (for his theory of course) in making a **translation from the original** than the Holy Spirit, the Lord Jesus Christ and God Almighty combined, could do in **giving the original**." I regard that declaration of H C Harper as the limit of madness and meanness, and closely related to blasphemy. The question between us is in regard to the translation of the Greek preposition **eis** in Acts 2: 38. I contend that it should be made by the word **into** because it can be thus translated in every other instance where the preposition is connected with the word baptism in any of its forms. Harper contends that the word **for** should be used, though he could not use that word and make sense in scarcely any other scripture where it is connected with the word baptism. And then, in order to reproach me, he says that for my theory I can "do better" "than the Holy Spirit, the Lord Jesus Christ, and God Almighty combined, could do in **giving the original**." Now where is the point of comparison indicated by the words "better" and "than"? We are not in dispute about the giving of the original Greek text, nor has God, Christ nor the Holy Spirit given to us a translation into English. Where then is the point of comparison indicated by the words "better" and "than"? Neither Harper nor A McGary (as his endorser) nor any of his other friends will ever be able to show it! But such a comparison is like the reckless advocates of certain "Bible colleges" that I have opposed when they said of me, "He's fighting against God—he's fighting against God!"

2. Then after copying from W G Roberts and L S White,

neither of whom could make any just pretensions to accurate scholarship, even in regard to English, Harper assails me thus: "Is Bro. Sommer trying to help God Almighty out of a tight place? Can he make it plainer than God could give it in the **original**? Bro. Sommer may be great, but I, for one, am not willing to acknowledge that he is wiser than God Almighty." Such writing shows that H C H was "exceedingly mad."

3. In Matt. 26: 28 the subjects are blood, death and atonement. In Acts 2: 38 the subjects are water, obedience and forgiveness. These differences in subjects I contend **demand differences in the translation**, in order to avoid the implication that baptism has **the same relation** to remission of sins that the blood of Christ has. Baptism is a **condition** of remission to each person, while the blood of Christ was a **purchasing cause or price** of remission for the entire world of mankind. To this I add that not only words, but phrases, expressions, clauses and even sentences, are **known by their connection**. Judges of courts declare that "every document should be considered in its relation to each and all of its parts, and each and all of its parts should be considered in relation to the document as a whole." Let this be done in regard to the document concerning blood, death and atonement, also in regard to the document concerning water, obedience and forgiveness, and I shall be justified in my contention.

4. Harper again copied Franklin and Campbell. Bro. Franklin told me with his own lips, in Wellsburg, W. Va., in the spring of 1871 or 2, that he knew only enough of Greek to be able to hunt up a word in the Greek text and its meaning in a Greek dictionary. And as this is a question of critical translation Bro. Franklin ought not to have been introduced in this controversy. Yet I may say in his behalf that in dealing with hobbyists for instrumental music he knew enough to call for a consistent translation of a certain Greek word, even as I, in dealing with rebaptism hobbyists, have called for a consistent translation of a certain Greek preposition. In both instances the hobbyists have despised a consistent translation. And there's a reason. **It would ruin their hobby.** As for Bro. Campbell, I have already shown that his statement, that no one was ever required to be baptized for anything else than "for the remission of sins", is not correct.

5. In view of the foregoing remarks on Harper's third article, what becomes of this statement in the end of that article: "And Sommer is still floundering on the **eis**, unable to get up"?

Chapter IV

I next offer to my readers the 4th chapter of H. C. Harper's scurrilous pamphlet. These readers are requested to examine the word "scurrilous" in their dictionaries, and then notice Harper's style. In the following chapter he passed from my tract on "Sectism" to my discussion with McGary:

CHAPTER IV

No sectarian perverter ever became more desperate and reckless in trying to sustain his teaching than Sommer does.

He says: "The reader will recollect that by reference to the promise 'shall be saved' in Mark 16: 16 I showed that 'for the remission of sins' in Acts 2: 38 is **not a part of the command to be immersed.**"

As a matter of fact, Sommer has not shown nor can he show that **for the remission of sins** is not a part of the command in Acts 2: 38 any more than he can show that **in the name of Jesus Christ** is not a part of the command in Acts 2: 38.

But let us hear him. He says: "Another Disciple" seems to think that the expression 'for the remission of sins' in Acts 2: 38 is a part of the command to 'be baptized'. If so, then it is a part of the command to 'repent'. But this is not in harmony with the expression 'repentance and remission of sins' in Luke 24: 47. The word 'and' in that connection shows that **repentance** and **remission** are two different somethings, and not that one of them is a **part** of the other."

I would not take the time to notice such **twaddle** as Sommer here resorts to if it were not for the fact that he pretends to considerable astuteness and some regard him as one who knows when he speaks.

Let Bro. Sommer analyze the sentence in Acts 2: 38 if he can and show that the phrase **for the remission of sins** is not a part of the command. I promise him all that is coming to him when he undertakes the task. His prevarication is too apparent to be called sophistry.

In the first place, the phrase **for the remission of sins** does modify "repent". That phrase modifies **repent** and **be baptized** in this sentence. So say J. H. Thayer, James Strong, William R. Harper, Albert Harkness, A. J. Huntington, D. R. Packard, Levi L. Paine, J. C. Proctor, C. F. Sitterly, Alvah Hovey, Addison Hogue, Henry M. Harman, Robert Halley, Thomas D. Goodell, John B. Foster, Henry C. Cameron, Seth J. Axtell, Horatio B. Hackett, W. S. Tyler, W. J. Willmarth, whose names I have at hand.

But Sommer tells us: "**Repentance** and **remission** are two different somethings."

Certainly they are; and **remission**, a noun, and **for the remission of sins**, a complex adverbial phrase, modifying "repent and to be baptized," are two different "somethings".

Because an automobile is not a part of a watch is no reason why a mainspring is not a part of a watch. You must do better.

But, like the bad boy with his hand in the preserve jar, Bro. Sommer makes another effort to get out of a tight place; yet he never can make it until he turns loose all this near-sectarian foolishness.

He says: "But here is more on the same subject: The expression 'shall be saved' in Mark 16: 16, is against the idea that the expression 'for the remission of sins' in Acts 2: 38 is a **part** of the command to 'be baptized' as there recorded. Disciples generally understand that the expression 'shall be saved' in Mark 16: 16 means the same as the expression 'for the remission of sins' in Acts 2: 38. And as the former expression is not a part of the command to be 'baptized' neither is the latter."

I reply: In the first place, the "former"—Mark 16: 16—is not a "command", as Sommer calls it, at all.

And while "shall be saved," Mark 16: 16, and "remission of sins" are generally held to mean the same thing; yet no one that I know of ever contended that the expressions "shall be saved" and "for the remission of sins" mean the same thing, except those disciples that are wandering in a wild goose chase after material to support their near-sectarian foolishness. And in this they can outdo the sectarians themselves.

While "shall be saved" in Mark 16: 16 shows that belief of the gospel and baptism bring one to **salvation**, yet as J. W. McGarvey well says: "Peter's purpose in the expression **for the remission of sins** was not to indicate the mere fact that baptism brings one to remission, but to state the blessing in order to the attainment of which his hearers were to be baptized. In other words, he states a motive for the act." (New Com., p. 261.)

So we see that **for the remission of sins** in Acts 2: 38 has a wholly different meaning from "shall be saved" in Mark 16: 16.

I have given in my first article the world's best scholarship

on this passage. And this scholarship is accurately expressed by McIntock and Strong in these words: "**Eis** retains its proper significance, as indicating the *terminus ad quem* (the end to which), and tropically, that **for which**, or with a view to which a thing is done, . . . to be baptized for the remission of sins means to be baptized with a view to receiving this." (Cyclopedia, p. 640, Vol. I.)

And as to the meaning of "shall be saved," Dr. Burton (Oxford) voices the scholarship of the world so far as I have been able to ascertain when he says: "**Sothesetai, will be put in the way of salvation**: he will be released from all his former sins, and at the moment of his baptism will be in a state of salvation, and reconciled with God." (Greek New Testament.)

Hence we see that the expression "shall be saved" in Mark 16: 16 is **not** against the idea that the expression "for the remission of sins" in Acts 2: 38 is a **part** of the command to "be baptized" as there recorded.

Sommer has done nothing but quibble. He gets along no better than a sectarian who is trying to support sprinkling for baptism—he hops about as aimlessly as a chicken with its head cut off.

MY REMARKS

1. H. C. Harper, instead of offering my arguments in full to his readers, as I do his, has preferred to scrap them and say, "No sectarian perverter ever became more desperate and reckless in trying to sustain his teaching than Sommer does." Harper may have plenty of physical courage, but he has acted in his pamphlet as if he was a **religious coward**. I have never known a sectarian to be any more unfair than he has been toward me. I leave the reader to judge who shows the greater signs of being a sectarian perverter—the man who **prints** all his opponent says on a subject before he attempts to reply to it, or the man who charges his opponent with being a "sectarian perverter," and then **scraps** his writings.

2. Then notice the twenty names of sectarians that Harper refers to, not one of whom ever learned what the gospel of Christ is, in its simplicity and purity, or, at most, never had the courage to advocate it. Then the reader will further be able to judge who shows the greater number of signs of being a sectarian—the man who copied most of the meanings of three or four Greek lexicons concerning a certain Greek preposition, but **did not** copy from sectarian theologians, or the man who **failed** to copy lexicons with any degree of fulness, and then appealed to twenty sectarian expounders to assist him in making a show against me!

3. After various comments and copied remarks about the promise "shall be saved," in Mark 16: 16, and for the remission of sins in Acts 2: 38, Harper declares, "So we see that **for the remission of sins** in Acts 2: 38 has a wholly different meaning from 'shall be saved' in Mark 16: 16." Then a little lower on his page he declares, "Hence we see that the expression 'shall be saved' in Mark 16: 16 is **not** against the idea that the expression 'for the remission of sins' in Acts 2: 38 is a **part** of the command 'to be baptized' as there recorded." Now we have **Harper against Harper**, for he says these expressions under consideration are "wholly different", yet "**not against**" each other! If they are "wholly different" they are not only different in form, but in meaning, and do not refer even to the same subject,—**the subject of the sinner's salvation!** Yet they are "**not against**" each other!?

4. As his last paragraph Harper offers this: "Sommer has

done nothing but quibble. He gets along no better than a sectarian who is trying to support sprinkling for baptism—he hops about as aimlessly as a chicken with its head cut off.” Reader, compare this with his first paragraph of the chapter under review, and decide whether a man who thus writes is either a Christian or a gentleman, or anything except a scurrilous specimen of humanity who deserves only the pity and contempt of all honorable men and women.

5. I now state that the difference between Harper and me in this controversy is not concerning **baptism as an institution, ordinance or command**, but concerning the **extent and degree of information** the alien sinner must have before he can be scripturally baptized. The same has been true in my difference from A. McGary and others of similar contention. And in order to test those of that contention I have several times challenged them to affirm that the common version of Acts 2: 38 is a **correct translation in every particular, and that it must be all understood by all alien sinners before they can be scripturally baptized**. But when this proposition has been offered to them they have all shown “the white feather”. Not one of them seems willing to affirm that he understood the promise of “the Holy Spirit” when he was baptized.

Chapter V

And here is H. C. Harper’s 5th chapter of ribaldry against me. Let the reader examine his doctrine and see if I have misnamed Harper’s style of writing.

CHAPTER V

Sommer now comes out in the open and shows plainly why he has made a fight against the truth. Like the sisters of Cinderella and the golden slipper, if the foot does not fit the slipper it must be lopped off until it does. So since the Bible teaching does not fit sectarians, it must be cut down until it does; and Sommer starts in with the carving knife.

He says that those among the sects “who have been immersed generally do so because they wish to do **what divine authority** requires. Their immersion is not **sect-immersion**, but it is **authority immersion**.”

Again he says: “I state that the Baptists, as well as other sectarians, generally teach that Christ died for our sins, was buried and raised again, even as Peter preached on the day of Pentecost. The apostle Paul declares in 1st Cor. 15: 1-4 that these facts are ‘the gospel’. Therefore they preach the Gospel in its **facts**—its chief or fundamental facts. Then the Baptist and many others teach that people should believe in Christ, repent of sins, and confess faith in Christ. In thus teaching they teach that which means that they shall die to sin by ceasing the practice of sin. Then those that practice immersion require them to be immersed into the name of the Godhead. Of course, in connection with such teaching these sects or denominations speak of ‘getting religion’, ‘getting the power’, and ‘Christian experience’, and the confession required is made, as a rule, in a blundering way. All this I readily admit. Yet after all that may be admitted in regard to their errors certainly those that believe, repent, and confess their faith in Christ, and are immersed by single immersion into the name of the Godhead, certainly such **obey the right doctrine**. But after doing so they **join the wrong church**. This is their position and condition. All such are therefore required to repent of joining the wrong church, and turn from the wrong church they have joined, and join the Church of the New Testament. We find them as immersed believers, and when we show them the right way then many of them turn from the errors that

have been imposed on them, and turn into the right way. Many have done this since the beginning of the 19th Century, including Thomas Campbell and his son Alexander. And when others follow their example I believe they should be received by us as immersed believers that **obeyed the right doctrine**, but have **joined the wrong church.**"

I reply: 1. When Daniel Sommer classes "Thomas Campbell and his son Alexander" with "such", he belies his better knowledge—he does! He knows full well that "Thomas Campbell and his son Alexander" were not baptized **according to sectarian usage**, but were baptized, as specifically stipulated, as "in apostolic times". They were not of those who simply **wish** to do that which **divine authority requires**, but they fully **did** do that which divine authority requires.

"His son Alexander," writing of this matter, says: "Down into the water I went, and was immersed into the name of the Lord Jesus for the remission of my sins—and you may rest assured, for that is a fact that I declare to you, I felt myself as fully relieved from the burden of my former transgressions, as ever did a man to whom the Lord said your sins are forgiven you."

Yes, and I, too, believe that "when others follow their example, they should be received by us as immersed believers that **'obeyed the right doctrine.'**"

But Sommer knows that seetrians do not do this; they make it very plain in every speech and prayer in this connection that they **do** just the opposite from this; and yet Sommer contends that since they **wish** to "do **what divine authority requires**," their baptism is "authority immersion," although they **do not** "follow their example" and **do what divine authority requires**.

But Sommer says they **wish** to do—**wish** immersion, you see. **What next will he come to?** "If wishes were horses, none need walk." Jesus says if the blind lead the blind, they go into the **ditch**. But maybe Sommer knows more than Jesus does about it.

Why this "stipulation" on the part of "Thomas Campbell and his son Alexander" that they should be baptized as "in apostolic times" if the sectarian way is "authority immersion?" Can Sommer tell us?

Truly F. W. Smith says: "The way of the commission is not the Baptist way. There is the width of heaven between the two ways, and any one who will compare the cases of conversion under the apostolic ministry and 'the Baptist way' can very clearly see this difference." (G. A., July 2, 1914.)

W. G. Roberts (Sommer knows him) says: "**Baptist baptism** is not scriptural anyway, as we will show farther on in other articles." (Forty Reasons Why I Am Not a Baptist.)

And evidently he considers United Brethren baptism no better; for he says: "When I went in the U. B. church I was put under the water; that is, about six months after I went in I was put under the water; we waited for warm weather and warm water. I afterward learned I had not been baptized, and demanded baptism."

If Sommer had been there, he could have saved Roberts all this trouble. No doubt Sommer would have said: "Certainly", Roberts, "**such obey the right doctrine**. But after doing so they **join the wrong church**. This is their position and condition. All such are therefore required to repent of joining the wrong church, and turn from the wrong church they have joined, and join the church of the New Testament. We find them as immersed believers," friend Roberts.

But in the absence of this teacher, W. G. Roberts says: "I afterward learned I had not been baptized, and demanded baptism."

Brother Roberts must have found a New Testament somewhere and read it; for as Campbell says: "Baptism has both a meaning and a design. It must be received in that meaning and for that design, else it is another baptism and not the one commanded by Christ and practiced by his holy apostles."

Again he says: "As we have, then, but one Lord, one faith, and one baptism, and that baptism is **for the remission of sins**,

—to give us, through faith and repentance, a solemn pledge of pardon, any other baptism is a human invention and of no value, wanting, as it does, the sanction of the Lord Jesus, who ordained it”.

Again Campbell says (Sommer quotes Campbell, you know): “The Baptists, too, borrowing every thing from their pedobaptist brethren but the subject and action of baptism, [Sommer seems to think this is all there is to New Testament baptism], have reduced it to a mere form of making the Christian profession—a door into their church. But when in, they harmonize in everything with those without the pale of their communion. So that, among all those parties, there is no true and scriptural dispensation of baptism.” (**Campbell on Baptism.**)

And yet after Campbell refuses to take this **reduced** baptism and demands baptism according to the New Testament pattern, like Roberts, and, too, writes as we have seen against this **reduced** baptism in the strongest terms of condemnation,—after all this, I say, Brother Sommer tries to make the impression that the Campbells just “repent of joining the wrong church, and turn from the wrong church they have joined, and join [by what hook or crook he does not tell us] the church of the New Testament.”

But as a matter of fact, the Campbells became members of the church of the New Testament by obeying “the right doctrine,” for then it was that the Lord added them to the church. (Acts 2: 38-46.)

2. Will Sommer tell us how one does “join the church of the New Testament” if not by obeying “the right doctrine”? If the same process that makes one a christian does not make one a member of the church of the New Testament, let Sommer show what else the Lord requires. And if “Baptists and other sectarians” are already christians, they are already members of the church of the New Testament; hence to talk about their “joining the church of the New Testament” is worse than nonsense—it is idiotic.

Let us again hear Franklin. He says: “The kingdom of God, here, is the body of Christ, or the church of God. Entering into it is not the same thing as remission of sins; yet none enter into the kingdom of God who are not pardoned, or who do not obtain remission of sins. When we learn how a man gets into the kingdom of God, we learn how he obtains remission of sins; for the same process brings a man into the kingdom and to the remission of sins, and none enter into the kingdom that do not obtain remission of sins.” (The Gospel Preacher, II, p. 139.)

So if “The Baptists and other sectarians” are not already in the church of the New Testament, they have “not obtained the remission of sins.” And just as sure as they have “obeyed the right doctrine,” they have obtained the remission of sins and are in the church of the New Testament. And Sommer goes down, taking either horn of the dilemma he chooses.

I want Sommer to give the divine process by which “The Baptists, as well as other sectarians,” who, according to his teaching, have obeyed the right doctrine and have secured the remission of sins, can do this without becoming thereby members of the New Testament church, seeing, as Franklin says, “The same process brings a man into the kingdom (church) and to the remission of sins.”

3. Sommer says of “the Baptists, as well as other sectarians,” “Therefore they preach the Gospel in its **facts**—its chief or fundamental facts.” And he says: “Their immersion is not **sect-immersion**, but it is authority immersion.”

But again he says: “What is the position of the Church of Christ on this subject of re-baptizing those who come to us from the sects? That position has already been set forth in these words: ‘A majority of those who have been immersed by the sects should, no doubt, be immersed again’.”

Evident, then, it is that Sommer’s position is not “the position of the Church of Christ,” he himself being witness. This has been plain to most of us for some time; but there are still some who look upon Sommer as “a safe teacher.” We hope

this will open their eyes. For if Peter preached "the gospel in its **facts**—its chief or fundamental facts," on the day of Pentecost, "the Baptists, as well as other sectarians," do not preach the gospel "in its **facts**—its chief or fundamental facts." If they did, there would be no "A majority of those who have been immersed by the sects" to come under "this subject of re-baptizing." A man can be born but once, either of the flesh or "from above."

So Sommer stands a self-condemned factionist.

MY REMARKS

1. Let the reader read again the first paragraph, and then the last sentence of this fifth chapter from H C Harper, and decide in regard to his fairness and unfairness. He never seems willing to let his readers judge for themselves, but he must begin and end each chapter against me by judging for them. He must have a contemptible estimate of the intelligence of his readers!

2. Near the beginning of the chapter now under review Harper made his best effort thus far shown in his pamphlet to let me speak to his readers. He actually copied an entire paragraph from my tract! I am gratified to notice this evidence that he is not "totally depraved," or is not a "splinter from the butt-end of total depravity." But I am saddened to notice that he did not inform his readers that he copied from my discussion with A McGary, and was not then reviewing the tract that he began to review! Thus his little vestige of fairness is damaged by unfairness. No wonder! **His unfair cause requires him to be an unfair man!**

3. Let the reader notice what I said, and what Harper declares about Thomas and Alexander Campbell. He says of me, "He belies his better knowledge—he does!" No I don't, for the biography of Alexander Campbell shows that **after his baptism he joined the Baptist church and remained in connection with it for near or about twenty years.** In order to avoid starting another denomination he advised the Brush Run congregation to go into the Red Stone Baptist Association, and later he, personally, went into the Mahoning Association, and was not clear of Baptist Associations **till about twenty years after his baptism in 1812.** But if Campbell understood himself as well as he afterward declared, why did he go among the Baptists, debate in their behalf, and offer seven volumes of his journal titled "Christian Baptist," which he commenced to send forth in 1823—nearly twelve years after his baptism in 1812? Let Harper deny this if he is not "totally depraved," or "exceedingly mad"; or let him explain it without contradicting himself

4. Harper charges me with something "worse than nonsense," and with something "idiotic," when I write of "obeying the **right doctrine**," but "joining the **wrong church**." In response I refer to Alexander Campbell, who obeyed the **right doctrine** when he was immersed, but joined the **wrong church** when he went into the Red Stone Baptist Association of Western Pennsylvania, and remained there till he thought he was liable to be excluded, and then went and joined the Mahoning Association of Eastern Ohio.

Chapter VI

I offer next the sixth chapter and last of low-graded writing as found in H C Harper's pamphlet.

CHAPTER VI

But Sommer has at last found "sect baptism." He says:

"In the light of this definition is there any baptism which may be justly called 'sect baptism'? Yes, trine immersion may be thus called with justness. It is not mentioned in the gospel and it originated with the falling away from the primitive faith or pure gospel, which falling away occurred after the apostles had finished their ministry. Moreover, it is now advocated by certain sects which are not mentioned by name in the Bible. Nor is this all. It originated in human choice, as is evident from the fact that it is now advocated and defended by human reasoning, and by means of human history."

And why does Bro. Sommer reject "trine immersion" as "sect baptism--?"

Is it not "performed in the name of the Godhead"? And do not those who submit to it do so "because they wish to do what divine authority requires"? Yes, sir.

But he tells us—

1. "It is not mentioned in the gospel."

Very well. Now will he be so kind as to tell us where the baptism of the one who believes he is saved before baptism—be it "single immersion" or "trine immersion"—is mentioned in the gospel?

No, he never will do this—he simply cuts his own head off.

2. "It originated with the falling away from the primitive faith or pure gospel."

Very well. Then any baptism, "single" or "trine"—is not scriptural if it does not accord with that of "the primitive faith or pure gospel."

Now will Bro. Sommer have the audacity to tell us that a baptism "because of the remission of sins" is found in "the primitive faith or pure gospel"? Let him speak out!

3. "It is now advocated by certain sects which are not mentioned by name in the Bible."

Well, if this is an ear-mark of "sect baptism," every immersion administered according to sectarian teaching is "sect baptism." Sure! That is exactly Campbell's contention—it is "a human invention."

4. "It originated in human choice."

So be it. Then the baptism of a person who believes he has the remission of his sins before he obeys in baptism is "sect baptism." If not, let Bro. Sommer find where such a baptism is authorized in the New Testament. If he cannot do this, away goes such a baptism, together with "trine immersion," Sommer himself being the judge. And if such baptism does not have to be defended purely by "human reasoning, and by human history," let him find Bible statements for it. I challenge him to do it! If such baptisms are not "a human invention," just find where the Lord ordained them. Who wants the job? Don't all speak at once, now.

If Bro. Sommer could leave off his trumpeting of his Ashdodish twaddle that is as senseless and immeaning in the light of the gospel as the prating of an idiot, he might find the "one baptism" authorized by the "one Lord"; namely, the baptism commanded "for the remission of sins." (Acts 2:38.) But to this he is as blind as a bat until he undertakes to defeat a Baptist or other sectarian. Then he says: "The practice of baptizing because of the remission of sins is an unscriptural practice," and kicks his own little cob house to pieces. Of course, he has sense enough to know that the truth is the only thing with which to down a sectarian. And I want to tell him right here—What's sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander! And down he goes!

He defines "sect baptism" thus: "But that is sect baptism, and is faction-baptism, which makes a faction in the church of Christ."

Sure! And Sommer admits that "trine immersion" is "sect baptism." And I have shown that a baptism under the perverse "faith alone" teaching, as practiced by the sects, must go with it. And the man who indorses such baptism is guilty of producing "a faction in the church of Christ." There is the

man, and Sommer is his name. If I have not proved him a factionist, let me know and I will double the dose!

Sommer again quotes Alexander Campbell, but to no better advantage for his theory than his former effort. Taking this quotation as Sommer evidently hopes the readers that are not familiar with the writings of Bro. Campbell on this subject will take it, makes Campbell flatly contradict himself and repudiate his life-long teaching.

In discussing **The Ancient Gospel**, one of the best series of articles ever written on "the design of baptism," Campbell says:

"Some persons have thought that because they did not understand the import of Christian immersion at the time of their immersion, they ought to be immersed again in order to enjoy the blessings resulting from this institution; but as reasonably might a woman seek to be married a second, a third, or a fourth time, to her husband, because at the expiration of the second, third and fourth year after her marriage, she discovered new advantages and blessings resulting from her alliance with her husband, of which she was ignorant at the time of her marriage. It is true that she may regret that she lived so long, in that state without enjoying the privileges belonging to her, but her having the right of matrimony celebrated ten times, or once for every new discovery she makes, would give her no better right to these enjoyments than she possessed through her first marriage. Nor will her repetition of the nuptial rights cause her to enjoy more fully the comforts of which she was deprived during the past years of her ignorance, than the mere consciousness that she now enjoys them."

Bro. Sommer asks: "Will those who call every immersion 'sect baptism' which was performed without understanding what they call 'the design of baptism' accept what Alexander Campbell said in the foregoing paragraph as his real position on the subject of re-immersion?" And he answers: "Yes, if they be honest." "Moreover," he says, "they will accept what he says as the truth on the subject."

I reply: Certainly, this is Campbell's real position, and this is the truth on the subject. And all may know ("if they be honest") that to make this teach what Daniel Sommer sets forth as the truth on this subject of "re-baptism" in his tract, is a gross perversion.

Does Bro. Sommer (or anybody else, for that matter) believe that Campbell here repudiates his action in his own baptism when he was baptized "by special stipulation" according to "the New Testament pattern," that is, upon a confession of Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the living God, and "for the remission of sins"?

Why this stipulation if "the Baptist way" is the way of the New Testament, or near enough to it to constitute what he calls "a divinely authorized baptism"? Yes, and echo answers, why?

Did Campbell write—and write—and write, setting forth the New Testament baptism, and say: "The Baptists, too, borrowing everything from their Pedobaptist brethren but the subject and the action of baptism, have reduced it to a mere form of making the christian profession—a door into their church. . . So that, among all these parties, there is no true and scriptural baptism. (Campbell on Baptism, p.271.) And then, too, refuse to receive this "reduced" baptism. After all this, I say, did Campbell turn round and teach that "the Baptists, as well as other sectarians" "do **what divine authority** requires: their immersion is not **sect-immersion**, but it is **authority immersion**," as Sommer teaches? Never, never!

Any one that is honest can see that Campbell is here considering the facts in regard to a **legal** marriage ceremony and the blessings **resulting** from such a ceremony. A person does not have to be much above a simpleton to know no such "advantages and blessings" **result** from an illegal marriage ceremony. And no such "spiritual privileges, honours, or immunities" follow as **consequences** a baptism not "divinely-instituted." And Campbell says: "**The only divinely-instituted baptism is for the remission of sins.**" And having clinched the fact as to "all special privileges, honours and immunities" following, as conse-

quences, such a baptism, he continues right on with the main argument on "the design of baptism", saying: "Evident, then, it is, that there is no **specific design** on account of which any one can constitutionally be baptized, except it be fore the remission of sins previously committed." (Campbell on Baptism, pp. 252, 253.)

Now to what passages does Campbell refer in connection with these "spiritual privileges, honours and immunities"? Does he include Acts 2: 38? No, sir. He says that "remission of sins is the leading and introductory [the legal ceremony, if you please, in marriage] blessing—from which follow [Now, do you get the marriage illustration], as consequences, all spiritual privileges, honors and immunities. 'For, if you be Christ's, then you are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise'."

But to what passages does he refer? They are: Rom. 6: 3; 1 Cor. 10: 2; 1 Cor. 12: 13; Gal. 3: 27. And he says: "These four passages complete the canon—the whole volume on the subject of the [Now get this!] relation of baptism to spiritual rights, privileges and honours."

Of course, the life of the christian (married woman) is a growth; new blessings will be enjoyed, new honors will come, new privileges will be discovered; and the woman if legally married need not repeat the marriage ceremony, nor need the christian if legally (according to apostolic teaching) baptized, repeat this act in order to enjoy these things.

The man who can't get Campbell's point in the marriage ceremony is as blind as a gate-post.

When discussing the "introductory" rite (the legal ceremony, in the marriage illustration), Campbell says: "Some have such a puerile and inadequate conception of baptism, as to regard it as a mere ceremonial introduction into the church—a way of making a profession of the Christian religion—no way effecting the spiritual relations of the subject. This view ought to have been expressed by such a precept as the following: 'Repent and be baptized, every one of you, for admission into the church.' But no such precept, in form, in substance, or in sense, is found in God's own book. As we have, then, but one Lord, one faith, and one baptism, and that baptism is 'for the remission of sins'—to give us, through faith and repentance, a solemn pledge and assurance of pardon, any other baptism is a human invention and of no value; wanting, as it does, the sanction of the Lord Jesus, who ordained it." (Campbell on Baptism, pp. 256-7.)

No wonder, then, that Campbell says: "So that, among all these parties [Baptists and Pedobaptists] there is no true and scriptural dispensation of Christian baptism." (Ibid., p. 272.)

Campbell is combatting those who were contending that one "ought to be immersed again in order to enjoy the blessings resulting from this institution" (baptism), not that one need not be immersed **for the remission of sins**. And we might correctly apply his illustration (the marriage ceremony) in refuting those who argue that one after being scripturally immersed, should be immersed again every time he sins. A legal marriage ceremony and a scriptural baptism induct into the new state, where all blessings may be enjoyed; but an illegal marriage ceremony and "any other baptism" are "human inventions and of no value." And as I said, Campbell is considering one who has been scripturally immersed and one who has been legally married. And nothing can be made out of this to support Sommer in saying that those among the sects "who have been immersed generally do so because they wish to do **what divine authority** requires. Their immersion is not **sect-immersion**, but is **authority immersion**."

Nothing is farther from the truth. Their immersion is "a human invention," as Campbell says, "and of no value; wanting, as it does, the sanction of the Lord Jesus, who ordained it."

And Sommer is still down.

H C HARPER.

MY REMARKS

1. Single immersion into the name of the Godhead **did not originate with the apostasy**, but trine immersion **did then originate**. Yet because single immersion has sometimes been prac-

ticed by sectarians, Harper classes it with trine immersion when thus practiced. Yet he shows himself to be as intense a sectarian on the question between him and me as I have ever seen, and perhaps as intense as ever lived. Besides, he has mentioned and copied from **twenty different sectarian commentators in order to make his sectarian extreme seem plausible!**

2. Harper persists in trying to shift the controversy from the **real question to one that is not real.** He and I are not differing about **baptism as such**, but about **the amount and degree and accuracy of information** which each candidate for baptism must have in order to be scripturally baptized. McGary and I discussed this real question, and our discussion is printed in tract form, and he thought so little of his part of that discussion that he was not disposed to recommend it very much, if any. But from the Review office it is advertised every week, if not every day in the week.

3. When a candidate for baptism among sectarians thinks his sins are pardoned before his baptism he is in error on that account, but that error does not prevent him from going on with his obedience in baptism. Harper says such error invalidates his baptism. I deny that he has **the right to make such denial**, and for this reason, as well as for other reasons: **All the Jews that were baptized before Cornelius was baptized, and before his baptism was reported to them and understood by them—all those Jews, I say, were in error concerning Christ's atonement for the world, but thought it was for the Jews only. YET THAT ERROR DID NOT INVALIDATE THEIR BAPTISM.** But if Harper and McGary had been living in those days, or any others of their class had been there, they might have stirred a tremendous racket by denouncing all the baptizing thus far done because of an error **in the minds** of the candidates at the time of their baptism. Over thirty years ago I challenged McGary to affirm **that valid baptism requires that the candidate's mind must be free from all error at the time of his baptism.** But he showed the white feather, even as Harper has been doing by refusing to affirm his real position, by shifting the controversy, and by suppressing my arguments, and by scrapping my writings.

4. Read this: "If Bro. Sommer could leave off his Ashdodish twaddle that is as senseless and immeaning in the light of the gospel as the prating of an idiot." I leave my readers to judge the man that would thus write of me while designating me as "brother."

5. Harper again refers to Campbell. But I have disposed of his case in two preceding articles. (a) I showed Campbell was wrong when he said, **no one was ever commanded to be baptized for anything except remission of sins.** (b) I showed that he did not understand fully what his baptism meant or he would not afterward have joined the Baptists and remained with them for near or about twenty years. To this I add that in 1823 Alexander Campbell wrote against all missionary societies, educational societies, and even Bible societies as organizations, yet before 1850 he had endorsed all of those societies. I copied of what Campbell wrote on one question, but did not endorse the man. Harper seems disposed to **endorse the man**, and therefore let him defend his period among the Baptists if he can. Harper ridicules the idea of a man **obeying the right doctrine, but joining the wrong church.** If this can't be done, then the Bap-

tist church must be the right church, or Campbell did not obey the right doctrine! Here is something for Harper to **harp** on.

6. As Alexander Campbell's writings, and especially in his book titled "Campbell on Baptism," have been largely copied by Harper, we may suppose that he would have us to believe that Campbell was and is a **standard** by which to measure. I therefore make a few remarks concerning him as shown by his writings.

His book on baptism is **fundamentally wrong**, as he had an opportunity to find out in his debate with N. L. Rice, and as all others that adopted that book have had a chance to find out when in debate with critical sectarians. Campbell adopted the idea that **baptizo** is a word of **specific action**, and that action is to **dip**, or a **dipping**. But this will not bear the test of close criticism, either as that word is used in classic Greek, or in the Greek of the New Testament. The word **baptizo** is a word of **generic** meaning, and its general meaning is best expressed by the words **overwhelmed** and **covered**, and these words are expressive of a **state or condition**. And whether that state or condition is accomplished by a pouring, as in the baptism by the Holy Spirit, or by a crucifixion, as in the baptism of the Savior by his sufferings, or by the cloud and the sea together, as in the baptism of the Israelites unto Moses—the result is the same. It was the state or condition of an overwhelming or a covering that was meant **regardless of the process by which that state or condition was accomplished**. In view of all this I again state that Alexander Campbell's book on Baptism is **fundamentally wrong**. This has been my conviction for nearly forty years. Campbell was a learned man, an eloquent man, and a great man, but he was a rhetorician more than a logician, and his percepts were larger than his reflectives. In 1823 he astonished many by declaring of the primitive churches, "They dared not transfer to a Missionary society, an Education society, nor a Bible society, a cent or a prayer, lest in so doing they would rob the Church of its glory, and exalt the inventions of men above the wisdom of God." Yet within thirty years after he thus wrote that Alexander Campbell had endorsed two Bible societies and helped them financially, had founded and had become president of an educational society known as Bethany College, and had become president of a missionary society to advance the Gospel in a foreign land! Yes, and after positively declaring that baptism was never commanded except **for** the remission of sins, yet in his debate with N. L. Rice he was compelled to admit **into remission** as a just translation in Acts 2: 38. Such is the record of Harper's "star witness" against me.

This is not all I could write on this subject, but what I have written is sufficient to show that in this instance "the smoke of the priest ascends instead of the smoke of the intended victim."

I said in the preceding paragraph that I could write more, and I shall venture one more reference to Alexander Campbell, as he seems to be Harper's "star witness", and the book titled "Campbell on Baptism" seems to be accepted by Harper as his chief standard of measuring. I have already stated that Campbell's idea that **baptizo** was and is a specific word, or word of specific action, was fundamentally wrong, and I showed

why I thus stated. I now state that Campbell was wrong in regard to the inspiration of the Bible, for he did not believe it was verbally inspired. On page 52 and in chapter 3 of his book on Baptism, Alexander Campbell declared this concerning the apostles of Christ: "But from what they have spoken and written we are authorized to think that they were as free in the selection of words and phrases as I am in endeavoring to communicate my views of their inspiration." This is an indirect denial of verbal inspiration, and an implied contradiction of Paul in 1 Cor. 2: 13, and many other scriptures. Thus Harper's "star witness" is again impeached! And therefore we may ask, **What is his exposition of Acts 2: 38 worth when considered in a critical examination?** I again say Alexander Campbell was an eloquent rhetorician, and not a logician. As a result, in the course of his public life, he "crossed his own path", or stultified himself, in regard to a majority of his chief declarations. Yet such is the character of Harper's chief witness! Again I say, that in this instance, "the smoke of the priest ascends instead of the smoke of the intended victim." In other words, **Harper is the man that is ruined in this controversy, and not Daniel Sommer.** To this I add that Harper puts something worse than a question mark on his whole tract when he links God up with the sectarian scholarship of this world, for the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. We could prove that at one time the world was flat by the sectarian scholarship of this world. We can prove that Harper came from a monkey by some such scholarship, and we can prove by some of the scholarship that baptizing for any purpose is all foolishness! Bring on your sectarian scholarship! Depend on sectarian scholars, and go with them in the day when such scholars of this world will get what's coming to them.

Here I turn from a misguided man who seems to hate certain sectarian errors so hatefully that he has become a sectarian in his hatefulness, and appeals to the testimony of many sectarians to help him to uphold his sectarian ideas. And I say the same of A. McGary with all other endorsers of H. C. Harper.

DANIEL SOMMER.

ADDED REMARKS

Since writing the foregoing I have heard of a sort of a debate held between two disciples on the re-baptism question. One of them asked the other, "If a man would come to you saying he felt his sins were pardoned and ask you to baptize him, would you do it?" The other answered that he "would not." Then said the one that asked the question, "Suppose that man would go to a Baptist preacher and be baptized, and then come to you for membership in the Church of Christ, would you receive him?" The other disciple did not answer, and the questioner with his friends thought a point had been gained against what is sometimes designated "sect-baptism."

But all such reasoning is subterfuge, and is intended as a dodge, or bluff, by extremists on the re-baptism question.

I have not a Baptist "Confession of Faith" among my books, but here is what the M. E. "Discipline" declares shall be the confession of faith in God and Christ: "Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ his only begotten Son our Lord . . ? All

this I steadfastly believe." I do not need to copy all that the book of "Discipline" offers on this question, for what I have copied is sufficient to show that the Methodists, at least, do require of candidates for baptism **a confession of faith in Christ as the Son of God, before they baptize them.** Besides, I fail to find one word offered about **feeling that their sins are pardoned** when persons appear as candidates for baptism.

Next I turn to my copy of the Presbyterian "Confession of Faith", and on page 336 I find this: "Baptism is not to be administered to any who are out of the visible church, till they profess their faith in Christ and obedience to him." This is copied from the Shorter Catechism of the volume before me, and I notice that the same is set forth in the Larger Catechism of the same volume.

Since writing the foregoing I have consulted Milner's book of Religious Denominations, and in his article on Baptists as a people I find this on the 36th page: "The Baptists therefore think that none ought to be baptized, but such as with all their heart believe the gospel." Then on the same page I find this also: "Neither birth, nor age, nor sex, nor condition, in their view, can qualify for Christian ordinances, but the **faith that worketh by love.**" Then the old Philadelphia "Confession", which I have borrowed, declares of baptism, "Those who do actually profess repentance toward God, and faith in and obedience to our Lord Jesus Christ are the only proper subjects of this ordinance." To this I add that I have just visited a Baptist preacher here in the city of Indianapolis, and he stated to me of himself and his people, "We always call for a formal confession of faith in Christ before we baptize persons."

In view of all this we can understand that when these re-baptism extremists declare that the sects baptize persons **without a profession of their faith in Christ they state what is not true**, and I think the apostle John would designate them as liars—if he could deal with them personally, as he did with certain others while here on earth. But as a rule those extremists are ready to say anything that they think will bluff those that oppose them on this question, or will make a show or pretext in their favor.

Many years ago in Parke Co., Ind., a certain man told me with his own lips that he made the confession and was baptized for the purpose of getting his wife, who was delaying on his account, to go into the church, though he didn't wish to go at that time. But at a later date he confessed sincerely and was baptized again. A brother lately reported the case of one who made the confession and was immersed "on a bet". Yes, and here is another case: at another place that I could name, many years ago, one of the Elders of the church there arose at the Lord's table and said that next Lord's day afternoon he intended to be baptized "for the remission of sins." Then he presided at the Lord's table, partook of the communion, and in course of that week acted with his brother Elders in a case of discipline; then partook of the communion the following Lord's day, and in the afternoon of that day was baptized "for the remission of sins." "Wasn't that a fright?"

All of this when taken together shows that we are not the ones to sit in judgment on the condition of mind and heart of those that confess faith in Christ and ask to be baptized. It shows likewise that those that are technical on the subject of re-

baptism indicate that they are genuine sectarians on that subject. Finally, I mention that those that disturb persons on the question of the genuineness of their immersion, by their extreme reasoning on that question, and immerse them again, are liable to disturb them for life, as those thus disturbed may always be in doubt whether their first or second immersion was acceptable to God.

D. S

