

Biblical Recorder

DEVOTED TO RELIGION, MORALITY, LITERATURE, AND GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

VOL. XXXI.

RALEIGH, N. C., JANUARY 30, 1867.

NUMBER

THE BIBLICAL RECORDER.

ADVERTISING RATES.

One square, one insertion	\$1 00
Two	2 00
Three	3 00
Four	4 00
Two months	8 00
Three months	12 00
Six months	20 00

TERMS.

One copy twelve months, \$3; one copy six months, \$2.

JOB PRINTING.

Of every description executed in a neat manner on reasonable terms. Particular attention paid to orders from schools for printing.

SOME OF THE REASONS AND FACTS WHICH MADE ME A BAPTIST.

BY REV. T. B. KINGSBURY.—NO. 10.

Discussion of Baptism—Dr. Campbell's testimony—B. Watson against Socinians—The result of Prof. Curtis's examination—Dr. Hall and President Shannon on the use of water employed to express the Application of Water, &c.

I purpose now to enter upon a discussion of *baptizo* and its derivatives. As only this word and its derivatives are used in the New Testament with reference to the rite of baptism, it may be important to offer some considerations with reference to it, which greatly impressed my own mind, and had no little influence in determining my final action. I have in previous numbers furnished the reader with a striking list of authorities who admit that the word *baptizo* in its native, primary sense means *plunge, to dip, to immerse*. Let the reader recur to these conclusions before he reads the remarks about to follow.

Baptizo is a Greek word having an obvious derivation. The English translation of the word *baptizo* is *baptize*, but merely to our language.

The celebrated Dr. Campbell, President of Marischal College, Aberdeen, Scotland, to whom I have had occasion to refer more than once, says, with reference to this failure of the translators to correctly render *baptizo*: "We have deserted the Greek names where the Latins have deserted them, and have adopted them where the Latins have adopted them. Hence we say *circumcision* and not *peritomy* (Greek *peritome*), and we do not say *immersion* (Latin *immersio*) but *baptism*."

In this instance retaining the Greek, or only anglicizing it. Dr. Campbell continues: "Yet when the language furnishes us with materials for a version so exact and analytical, such a version conveys the sense more conspicuously than a foreign name. For this reason, I should think the word *immersion* a better English name than *baptism*, were we now at liberty to make such a choice." This is the judgment of a very profound scholar and thinker. But are we not "at liberty" to make such a choice? It is to be hoped so! If this translation had been correctly made, then we would have read in Mark xvi, where the great commission is recorded: "He that believeth and is immersed, shall be saved, &c." Such was the command as given by our Saviour, himself. Dr. Richard Fuller very pointedly remarks that "to charge him with wrapping up his meaning in an obscure phraseology, is impious, it is to accuse him of the enormous guilt of the Roman tyrant, who hung his laws so high that people could not read them, and then inflicted severe punishment for their infraction." He says that the translators have shown that the pretext that there was difficulty in the word *baptizo* is unfounded, for "in the case of Naaman (II Kings), the Septuagint (the Greek translation of the Old Testament) uses *baptizo*, and the (English) translation renders it *dip*. Then went he down and dipped (baptizo) himself seven times in Jordan."

The Baptists are evidently right then, when they contend that there is in the word used by our Saviour, when he authorizes his disciples to baptize, a meaning sufficiently plain, definite and exclusive to imply necessarily that the rite of baptism is to be performed by immersing the body in water.

Let us now turn to the question of interpretation, i. e., whether a

command to *merse* is really given in the command to *baptize*. After the unanswerable arguments of Carson and others, (and all attempts at an answer thus far have signally failed,) this question ought to be put to rest forever. The concessions too, so abundant and clear, of the long list of eminent scholars and divines (not one of whom was a Baptist,) I have given, ought to silence ever hereafter all cavilling upon the subject.

Professor Curtis in his admirable work on the progress of Baptist Principles for the last Hundred Years, after examining Stuart, Campbell, Robinson, Bloomfield and others, in their critical researches to determine the meaning of *baptizo*, records this opinion, and the candid reader who has accompanied him in his interesting labors must admit its fairness. Says he: "Thus every use of the word, Classic and Hellenistic, literal and figurative, contributes to show that the command to *baptize* is a command to *immerse*, and that the word is never used literally (or even figuratively) without reference to this, the radical idea of the word, so that our word to *dip* is its perfect equivalent."

The meaning of the command being thus satisfactorily arrived at, it would really appear too plain for argument what we are to do upon making a profession of faith. "Arise and be immersed" is most clearly the divine injunction.

The following passage from the excellent work of Prof. Moll is so germane to the subject-matter, that I cannot withhold it from the reader. I invite the reader to pay special attention to the remarkable facts he gives. He says, "The Greek language is very copious, and has a particular word to express every motion, application, and use of water. For to sprinkle, it has *raino* or *rantizo*; to pour, *ekcheo* or *kathairo*; to wash, *lavo*; for to wash clothes, *pluo*; and for to purify, *agnizo* or *kathairo*; and all these words are used in the original of the Septuagint and the New Testament. The translators of our present English version were Pedobaptists; and they use in their translations the word *pour* and its derivatives more than one hundred and fifty times, the word *sprinkle* more than sixty times, the word *dip* and its derivatives more than twenty times, the word *plunge*, once, and the word *purify* a score of times. The word *baptizo* and its derivatives, when connected with the ordinance, they were forbidden to translate. Now the point of our present argument is this: "In no case where the original means clearly *pour*, *sprinkle* or *purify* (leaving out of view the references to the ordinance), is *bapto* or *baptizo* used; and in no case when it means to dip or immerse, is *raino* or *rantizo*, *cheo* or *ekcheo*, *agnizo* or *kathairo* used. Nowhere do our translators render *bapto* or *baptizo*, by *sprinkle*, *pour* or *purify*; and *raino* or *rantizo*, *cheo* or *ekcheo*, and *agnizo* or *kathairo*, by *dip*, *plunge*, or *immerse*." He refers to Leviticus iv: 6, 7, where *bapto* is translated *dip*, *raino* is translated *sprinkle*, and *ekcheo* is translated *pour*. The facts contained in this extract must appear very significant to every thoughtful mind. Hinton says in his History of Baptism: "It is too much to ask, that seeing *baptizo* is never found in the New Testament applied to sprinkling or pouring, but always to immersion; in future, those who *pour* or *sprinkle*, will cease to falsify the word *baptizo*, and speak of *rantizing*, or any other word that approximates in some slight degree to the process, rather than be so absurd as to use a word the most remote that possibly could be found in the Greek language."

President Shannon, of the College of Louisiana, in the third volume of his work, "The Christian Preacher," gives us the benefit of his own researches in regard to this word under discussion. He says: "While I filled the professorship of Ancient Languages in the University of Georgia, I had occasion to compile a table of passages where the words *dip*, *pour*, *sprinkle* and *wash*, in their various modifications, occur in the English Bible, with the corresponding term used in the Greek of the New Testament and the Septuagint. *Dip*, I found in twenty-one passages. In

all of these except one, *baptizo* is found in the Greek. The exception is in Genesis vi: 3, when Joseph's brethren dipped—*emalunon*—or *danbed*—it in the blood of the kid. Mark the great accuracy of the Greek here—the idea is that of dipping, and the Septuagint so expresses it.

"SPRINKLE, in some of the passages, I found in twenty-seven places. It is not a single instance of *baptizo* being used in the Greek. I found in no instance more than one hundred and nineteen instances of *dip*, but in not even one of them, I met with *BAPTO* or *BAPTIZO* in the Greek."

"I found *wash* in three cases, where reference was had to the whole person, but to no part of the eyes, the face, the hands, the feet. In none of these was *bapto* or *baptizo* found, but *raino* or *rantizo*. Reader, is not this very strange—nay, is it not wonderful if *bapto* means indifferently, *plunge*, *pour*, *sprinkle*, and some Pedobaptists say, *dip*? Why should *baptizo* be indifferently and invariably used to express the rite of baptism, unless *baptizo* was a specific act, which was precisely expressed, and no other word in the Greek would?

THE YOUNG CONVERT.

A word with you, my brethren and sisters. My interest has emboldened me to address my dear numbers, some plain and others concerning you, "withstood" them, because they were to be somewhat against you. Stand ye here all the few months ago you were full of bitterness, and the "baptism" of your sins.

There was no peace for you. You felt that you deserved to be cast into hell with all who forget God. Now you are so happy. You have new hearts, new hopes, new desires, and new aspirations. Why this marvelous and most gracious change? Who wrought it in your souls? It must all be ascribed to Christ. He redeemed you with his own precious blood, and renewed you by the Holy Spirit.

Do you not owe Him much for such love as this? He has a claim upon you. Will you honor that claim by a life of obedience? Have you been baptized? Are you members of the church? If not, why halt you between two opinions? Why defer till to-morrow what should be done to-day? You are required to confess Christ before men and to love his church; and you have either neglected, omitted, or refused to comply. You are wrong in thus disobeying your Saviour. *What have you done for Christ?* Do you say, "No one has invited us to labor for him?" The field is the world. There is room enough here for you. But has no one invited you to attend the Sabbath school and the prayer meeting; to visit the poor and aid in relieving them? "No one has invited us or seemed to care to have us do anything." Alas! for your brethren then. But this is not a valid excuse; some one has invited you. Jesus Christ has invited and commanded you to follow him. Why have you failed? Each gospel sermon is an invitation, from the "King of Kings," to you to become, not isolated laborers, but co-laborers with Him in his vineyard. And you are refusing his invitation. The moral condition of the world should induce you to labor for its elevation and regeneration. It carries the chill of death upon its head, the curse of the law rests upon its head. How mournful its condition.

Suppose you knew that a friend was asleep in a burning house, would you wait for some one to pass along and invite you to aid in arousing him? No, you would rush in and cry, "Fire! Fire!" and shake him, and if necessary drag him out by force to save him. Now you are required to do this for sinners. You can apply this simple illustration. You tell me that you are a member of the church. I bless God and

take courage, then, in speaking to you. I greet you as a brother or sister beloved. Though I have not seen you, you are my Heavenly Father's children. You are young, I too entered the church when I was a mere child, and it is to me a most painful reflection that for seven years I was inactive. I did scarce anything for Christ. And what sad years they were. O that I could recall them—that I had not omitted a solemn duty for seven years, that I had not murdered so much of precious time. They were not years of religious prosperity or of enjoyment to me, for they were years of disobedience and unfaithfulness to my precious Redeemer. No one invited me to labor or encouraged me to take up the cross. Pardon this "bit" of experience, but I may as well tell you that when I commenced trying to work for Jesus, I began to "weed" my heart of the sins that did beset me. As I fought sin in others I fought it in my own heart. I am a sinful man, and yet I would not give the sweet consolation that springs from the reflection that I have been enabled to spend the year now closing in preaching the gospel to sinners, for all the honors and pleasures of the world. I am contented to prosecute this work—I cannot put it down, for it fills my soul with comfort. Are there not young men in nearly all our churches who have felt that it was their duty to preach the gospel? Where is that intelligent student, the talented lawyer, the man who can plead for the rights of the oppressed, who was converted last year? What is he doing now? Are there not young men in nearly all our churches who have felt that it was their duty to preach the gospel? Where is that intelligent student, the talented lawyer, the man who can plead for the rights of the oppressed, who was converted last year? What is he doing now?

With a good deal of curiosity and interest to know what the New Versionists would make of it—whether they would help us out of the total darkness in which we are left as to the meaning of the passage by the common translation. But to my great disappointment they have made matters worse. This is their rendering: "For therein is revealed a righteousness of God from faith to faith; as it is written, the just shall live by faith." Now if any man can unriddle this, he must have more than the sagacity of an Oedipus.

They have made it worse than before; for the old translators were at least right in calling it the righteousness of God though there was no article in the Greek, it being unnecessary where such a qualifying word as *the righteousness of God* immediately followed; the genitive in that case having exactly the same definite effects as our genitive "God's" prefixed. Thus "God's righteousness" is exactly equivalent to "the righteousness of God," not to "a righteousness of God." But their copying the unintelligible old version in the following words, is the worst part of their offense. I offer to Biblical students the following interpretation of these most important words of the great apostle, the sense of which seem to me to have been entirely concealed from all common English readers by our unfortunate translation: "For therein is revealed to faith (i. e. the faithful) God's justification (i. e. God's mode of justification) by faith: as it is written: The just shall live i. e. be saved by faith," or perhaps still better thus: The just (or those justified) by faith shall live (i. e. be saved).

I crave the reader's particular attention to the fact, that by this version, not only a clear sense is evolved, consistent with the whole burden of the apostle's argument throughout the Epistle, but the propriety and relevancy of the quotations from the Old Testament are forcibly exhibited; whereas, by means of the other translations they are totally concealed.

Wilson, N. C. Jan. 15th.

DEAR BROTHER HUEHMAN.—A good while since, I promised to give you an account of sight-seeing and experience in a short life, part of which has been devoted to "the ministry of the word." As no one but yourself is to know who I am, I shall not be compelled to employ that miserable

editorial "we," to avoid the charge of egotism. I am, but one, too well know, a small one. I believe me if I tell you, that but little confidence in my ability to interest your readers, but your interest otherwise encourages me. Labor and care having increased, I gave you the promise to write and perform the task, craving the blessing pronounced upon one who "loveth to his own hurt, and chingeth not." The sketches may sometimes be headed with a line or two of poetry, as the chapters of a novel; but my dear H., they will not deal in fiction. They may commence with the text of scripture, yet my words, if they shall not be in the usual style of written sermons. Call them by what name you please; but I do not hesitate to declare that I am more particular about what you and your readers think of them. This I cannot know until they are written. When then delay? Shall I number them? It is altogether a matter of convenience. Here then is No. 1.

CHILDHOOD.

"Take this child a way and wages."—Exodus 2: 9.

It is possible for the heart to be dark and the eye to be bright, with peculiar recollections of a childhood spent in poverty-stricken surroundings, and a cause for sadness, and a source of tears.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.

Childhood.