

# *What Baptism is For:*

*A Reply to a Baptist*

BY MOSES E. LARD

Part of the  
Jimmie Beller  
Memorial eLibrary  
[www.TheCobbSix.com](http://www.TheCobbSix.com)

**WHAT BAPTISM IS FOR –**  
**A Reply to a Baptist**  
*By MOSES. E. LARD.*

Mr. Lard:

DEAR SIR:—Will you have the courtesy to state explicitly whether the body of the people with whom you stand connected hold that baptism is for, that is, in order to remission of sins? I have no motive in putting this question but to collect Information.

Very respectfully yours,

*A BAPTIST.*

**LETTER 1.**

My Dear Sir:—I can hardly think the author of the foregoing asks his question for his own benefit. Surely he is too familiar with our teachings to need I tell the information he seems to seek.—But whether he propounds his question for his own sake alone, or for the sake of others, I shall not require him to say. His question is important, respectful and pertinent. I shall therefore be at some pains to answer it.

But as this paper may be read by persons who do not enjoy his advantages, I think it prudent to preface my reply with a few preliminaries which I deem necessary to a proper understanding of the subject, and to prevent misapprehension.

Of the grounds of remission of sins we can, in and of ourselves, and independently of revelation, know nothing. From nature we derive no light, neither from human reason. For all our knowledge in the case, we are shut up to what the Bible says. It is our sole instructor. Its teachings fairly interpreted, and our information is

complete. Hence, in what I am about to say, my appeal shall be to that sacred Book alone.

Personally, we look to Christ for remission of sins. With us He is the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world. In His antecedent state we hold him to have been the Word, to have been *with* God and [is] God; that all things were created by Him, and that without Him was not even one thing made that has been made. The term *Word* we hold to be a name, incomprehensible surely by us, the name of an august Being who, as to His nature, is divine as the Father Himself; but who, in order to save man, took on Him a human body and thus became the Son of man. In regard to this glorious Being, who is to be honored as the Father Himself deserves to be honored, we think it best always to speak in the very terms of Holy Writ. We regard it as unwise to speak of him in the language of the schools, or to attempt to interpret Him in the light of human creeds. He is to be conceived of and spoken of in the language which inspiration itself has appropriated to him. This language, we adjudge, is not to be taken in a low sense, but in the highest and sublimest sense it is capable of bearing.—This, the nature of the case requires.

This glorious Being died for our sins, was buried, and rose again for our justification. In His death or blood we have the atonement, through the value and efficacy of which God can be just while justifying him who believes in Christ. But for the shedding of this blood there had been no remission. It is therefore the great meritorious ground of our salvation. By it we are redeemed, and through it cleansed from all our sins. But this cleansing is not unconditional; and here a distinction is to be drawn. The ground of remission is that which renders remission possible, so to speak, the great meritorious cause of it, as to God; while a condition is something which Christ appoints to be done by us that we may reach the remission which is in His blood. A condition is not to be viewed as a work of law, and therefore as of the nature of a merit; but as a simple act of obedience, and consequently as without merit in the sense of efficacy to procure remission. All efficacy is in the blood of Christ. A condition merely brings [one] into contact with this blood. Nor does a condition exclude the notion of mercy.—Compliance with a

condition does not earn remission, nor is it in any sense an equivalent for it. It is not something paid for remission. On the contrary, on the ground of the efficacy which is in the blood of Christ, when the appointed condition is complied with, then, and still of his own mercy, God bestows the blessing. And in thus speaking I beg that my terms shall be taken as all human terms should be when employed on difficult subjects, with due allowance for inaccuracy and inadequacy. Thus taken, I trust the candid reader will not find it difficult to discover my meaning.

I am now prepared to answer the foregoing question. We hold baptism to be for, in order to, remission in this sense and view only, that it is one of three conditions appointed jointly by Christ for this end. Having now answered the question as plainly as I can, I proceed to state the grounds on which the answer is based:

John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.—  
Mark 1:4.

One thing I shall here take for granted, namely, that the phrase “for remission of sins” is the true rendering of the original. I know not that this is questioned by any respectable authority. The question then is, *What was preached for remission of sins?* John preached something looking to this end; or in other words, in his preaching he commanded something to be done for it, or in order to it. What was the thing commanded to be done? The answer is to be sought in one of two words, or if not in one, then in both. John preached the baptism, one thing, of repentance, another, for remission of sins. Which now did he preach? Did he preach the baptism, or the repentance, or both?

Baptists generally, I believe, take the position that it was the repentance which was commanded for remission. This, if I recollect correctly, was the position of the late Dr. Campbell, of Georgetown, in his controversy with Mr. Campbell, of Bethany. Two things Baptists will concede, namely, that the persons whom John addressed were not penitents nor baptized, since they were required to perform both these acts. They will further concede that John baptized none but penitents.—Let us now substitute this word

for the noun repentance, and we have, John preached the baptism of penitents for remission of sins. This was precisely the fact in the case; and it makes John preach baptism for remission and not repentance. Or we may express the same fact thus: John commanded penitents to be baptized for remission of sins. This is clearer and possibly comes still closer to the reality. Or we may get at the same thought by slightly varying, thus: John commanded the Jews to repent and be baptized for remission of sin. This I like better, for I think that both their repentance and baptism looked to remission and were for it; though I believe the baptism was the act specifically named for it. The phrase baptism of repentance is the exact equivalent of the phrase baptism of penitents. It is called the baptism of repentance, because it was administered to none but penitents. On the condition that the subject repented and confessed his sins, John baptized him.—His repentance was the entitling consideration. His baptism grew out of it, as out of an antecedent, and was dependent on it. It is therefore called the baptism of repentance.

It is proper to add that the phrase “baptism of repentance for remission of sins” is found both in Mark and Luke. It was therefore the current form of speech used to connect baptism with remission. With it the Jews had become familiar; and to it they attached a single definite meaning. Consequently, when they subsequently heard it from the apostles, or anything closely resembling it, they would at once understand it in the sense in which John used it. They would not need to have the phrase defined. On hearing it, its meaning would instantly occur to them.

The sense in which I have taken the phrase is obviously the sense both of the English translation and of the Greek. It is the sense which first occurs to the mind; is easy and natural; and violates neither the laws of thought nor the rules of grammar.

The view of the phrase adopted by Baptists has all the appearance of a reluctant afterthought. It strikes us as novel and forced, and looks as though it had been invented to meet an emergency. Were it not a Baptist tradition that baptism is not the immediate antecede-

ent of remission, they would never have compelled the phrase to bear the unnatural interpretation they put upon it.

Now, although I hold that John's baptism, when administered to a penitent, was for, or in order to remission of sins, I readily grant that this circumstance alone does not determine the design of the baptism ordained by Christ. The design of His baptism is to be learned from the language used to indicate it. Still there is this gained by a reference to John's baptism: We learn the import of the formula of words which he used to connect baptism with remission. When, now, we find this same formula of words subsequently used by the apostles, we are compelled to conclude, if nothing intervene to inhibit, that they used it in the same sense in which John used it. In other words, by a reference to John's baptism we are growing familiar with the very words the meaning of which is to constitute our ultimate conclusion, and the matter of our faith in the case. As I do not intend these articles to be very long, I shall here put an end to this first one.

In the meantime, my dear sir, unless you are wholly unwilling that any one shall know your name, will you use your influence to have these articles reprinted in a few of your leading papers? From yourself and brethren I crave for them a candid reading. I shall aim to be just and fair; and believe I am not likely to become uninteresting to you.

Fraternally yours,

Moses E. Lard

## LETTER 2.

I have now stated the sense in which we believe baptism to be for, in order to, remission of sins, namely—that it is one of the three joint conditions appointed by the Savior for this specific end. This, with us, is an item of faith, held as firmly as we hold the resurrection of the dead. We hold it for the two best reasons which human ingenuity could assign, which are—that it is both actually asserted and necessarily implied in the New Testament. Now, if the item be thus taught, then you will readily grant that it is the duty of all men to believe as my brethren believe; and more than this, that it is wrong and dangerous to hold and teach as the Baptists do. The question, then, which I have to argue for your sake, is a question of fact, and is settled by a direct appeal to the New Testament. Does the New Testament actually assert and necessarily imply that baptism, jointly with faith and repentance, is for, in order to remission of sins?

You will notice that I call baptism a condition of remission. It is not, then, a cause of remission. Remission does not follow baptism, when preceded in the subject of it by faith and repentance, as an effect follows its cause. Remission follows baptism, not from any natural connection between them, as in the case of cause and effect, but solely because it is appointed to follow it. The connection is arbitrary, not natural; still, it is not to be deemed the less close on that account, nor the result the less certain.

You will readily grant that antecedently to the appointment of baptism by Christ we could not, by the light of nature, anticipate what it would be for. Preconceived notions would here avail nothing. As baptism has its origin in the mind of Christ, so an expression from his mind alone can indicate its design. Human reason and human conjecture have here positively nothing to do. If baptism has a design, inspiration tells us what it is; and if inspiration is silent on the point, then either baptism has no design or it has an unknown one. You will not say, “Baptists do not say that it is without a design.” What design, then, does inspiration assign to it?

Now, certainly it is not impossible that baptism may be for remission of sins. This, as a logician, you will not deny. And if it be not

impossible that it is for remission, then it may be for it; and if it may be for it, then the question, "Is it for it?" is legitimate and open for investigation as any other simple question of fact.

But I have still another important preliminary or two to settle before proceeding further. If baptism, jointly with faith and repentance, is for remission of sins, how, most likely, is the fact indicated? It is indicated certainly in the New Testament, but how? That is, what means are most probably used to indicate the fact? The same, I believe you will say, that are used to indicate the design of faith and repentance, when they are viewed simply as conditions of remission. This I think correct.

Furthermore, you will agree that we are most likely to discover the design of baptism in some of those passages of Scripture, which speak to the sinner, or unpardoned man, or of him, and with direct reference to remission of his sins. In such passages we would naturally expect to find the design of the ordinance brought out.

With these preliminaries, I cite as the second ground of the faith of my brethren the following:

And He said unto them, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and in baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned."—Mark 16:15-16.

In re-considering this passage, you will be careful to note the following items: It first tells the apostles what they were to do: "Go preach the gospel." It next tells them to whom they were to preach: "every creature;" that is, all men and women. Now, from the whole number preached to, in all time, in all places, the Savior selects a particular class, of each of whom He says, "he shall be saved." This language is not merely a promise; it is also an affirmation. It affirms what will be, what will always be, what will never, while time endures, fail to be, when a person to whom the gospel is preached, does the two things named in it.

He that "believeth"—This is one thing to be done, a thing to be done by the creature, an act appointed by Christ, a condition to be



complied with before the affirmation in the language, “shall be saved,” applies in the case or is of any effect. To believe and to have faith are the same. This you will not deny. And “is baptized”—this is the other thing to be done, a thing to be done by the creature, an act appointed by Christ, a condition to be complied with before the affirmation in the language, “shall be saved,” applies in the case or is of any effect. I confess I see not how it is possible to detect a flaw in this presentation of the case. If there be one in it I am incapable of seeing it.

Of whom does the Savior say, “He shall be saved?” The answer is overwhelmingly clear. He says it of him who believes and is baptized. These are two acts, separate and distinct acts; and of every one of whom they can be truly affirmed, it can also be as truly affirmed that he is saved. If it were absolutely true, looking to the future, that he who believed and was baptized should be saved, then it is to be held as equally true, looking to the past, that he who has believed and been baptized, is saved. The “shall be” of the Savior was realizable on two named conditions; hence, on compliance with these it must be held as actually realized.—No reasoning can be sounder than this.

Some things, my dear sir, must be held as settled in the word of God. It is high time we ceased to view it as a book of indecisions and uncertainties. Among the things which should be held us settled are the place and design of baptism. The language, “he that believeth and is baptized,” appoints and specifies two acts to be done. It appoints them jointly and makes them equal. From this language alone no human being can tell to which the Savior attached the greater importance. He mentions both acts alike, in immediate connection; neither is qualified in any way; they consequently stand on precisely the same level. But you tell me you cannot think both acts equally important. What you think is not the question. In what mode does the Savior appoint the acts; and how, as to importance, do they stand in the passage which ordains them? Is either here placed above the other, or is either depressed? Why, then, do you presume to grade them when the Savior himself has done nothing of the kind? I protest against creating differences where the Bible makes none.

But you will not deny that the Savior's language appoints the two acts to be done. Now, what does he appoint them for? You are compelled to admit that whatever he appoints the one for he appoints the other for.—Alike they look to the same end; alike they are for the same end. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "Saved" is the end to which they look; it is what they are for. More in this direction and on this point would be useless. As certainly as faith is for salvation, so certain is it that baptism is for it.

But does the word "saved" include remission of sins? When the Savior said, "he that believes and is baptized shall be saved," did he mean that, though saved, the party would still be unpardoned? Surely not. The salvation named was the salvation procured by the blood of Christ, and this indisputably includes remission of sins.—"Shall be saved," therefore, means saved from sin or forgiven. This no fair-minded person will question. Now, since the Savior, in the passage in hand, appoints belief and baptism to be for salvation; and since this salvation, if not identical with remission of sins, which I believe it is, must of necessity be held to include it, it therefore follows that belief and baptism are appointed to be for remission of sins. This reasoning can hardly be said to lack the precision of mathematical reasoning; and since its premises are divine, its conclusion is certainly true.

But you will say, "What of other passages bearing on the same subject?" I reply, we are too much in the habit of jumping from one passage to another in order to evade the force of the former. Each passage and sentence in the word of God has its own independent value and meaning. In each case let these be first settled. Then let us compare and combine. The result will constitute the sum of our knowledge as well as the sum of our duties. We have now seen what John's baptism was for, when administered to a penitent. Compare this with what Christ's baptism is for, when administered to a believer. The conclusion is, that what one was for the other is for.

In each succeeding article, as in this and the preceding one, I shall construct a single argument based on a single passage of Scripture.

Thus my investigation will be strictly inductive. Consequently the whole ground on which our faith rests will not appear till the last passage has been examined. I shall then be prepared to draw the final conclusion.

As before, fraternally yours,

Moses E. Lard

### LETTER 3.

My illness for the past two weeks has confined me closely to my bed, and unfitted me for every kind of labor, especially mental labor. This will account to you for the fact that the last two numbers of our paper have failed to contain replies to your inquiry. I regret the interruption, as I doubt not you do; but since no one can be blamed for it, I hope all will consent to bear it with becoming grace.

You will bear in mind my position, that baptism to him who is a believing penitent is for, in order to, remission of sins. Thus, for baptism independently of faith and repentance, we claim nothing. It is void. My brethren, with faultless unanimity, insist that no one is to be baptized except the believing penitent.

The question, then, which I am considering for your benefit is, when precisely and neatly stated, *What is the baptism of the believing penitent for?* I need not reiterate the reply. The grounds on which we hold such baptism to be for remission of sins, you will remember I stated, are two. These are that the doctrine is both asserted and implied in the New Testament; and if in this I am correct, then I shall deem you to be too just to dissent from my conclusions.

My last article was based on the Savior's declaration: "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved," My dear sir, let me insist that this passage, of itself, settles the issue between you and me, if issue there be. Its single terms are clear up to the height of perfection; and as a sentence there hangs over it not one doubt which hangs not equally over the fact of Christ's death. It affirms salvation of him who believes and is baptized. This human speech could not make clearer. And in affirming salvation of him who believes and is baptized, it renders faith and baptism essential to the salvation it affirms. It makes them the two conditions of it. I should mourn to know that you doubt this. Does the salvation of the sentence include remission of sins? If you say it does, then your question is answered. Faith and baptism are for a salvation which includes remission of sins. They are, therefore, for remission itself. This is all we hold, all we affirm. Or do you say that the salvation

of the sentence does not include remission of sins? If so, I decline to write one line more for your benefit. You are hopelessly blind.

You will doubtless wish to know if I hold baptism to be a condition of remission of equal value with faith. I protest against all such questions, for the reason that they lead to profitless speculation, and can never be settled. If the New Testament makes faith a condition of remission, this is enough. Our duty is settled and clear, and with this performed we should decline to speculate. And so of baptism. Of its absolute or relative value we can determine nothing. Is it a condition of remission? We settle this question and raise no other. As a mere condition of remission, baptism may be the equal of faith, and it may be less. What then? Suppose it to be infinitely less in value. Is it, therefore, of no value, or therefore, not a condition? May we set it at naught, and count it an idle thing? Let us, my dear sir, beware how we suffer our shallow reasonings to determine that this act is of value, and that not, where Christ has appointed both.

Baptism is a mere act to be performed once, never again. As a duty, it is instantly discharged, and never recurs more. Not so, however, with faith.—It is a great principle of action, continuous throughout the Christian's life. From before his birth into the kingdom of God, till angels bear him hence, it may never break even for an instant, in this it is unlike repentance. The duty to repent recurs with every new sin. Seven times a day it may become a fresh duty. Not so [with] faith. This begins before baptism, runs to it, is parallel with it, stretches on beyond it, is present in every renewed act of repentance, underlies our love in Christ, and is its basis—in a word, is the great dominating and all-controlling principle of Christian action. Viewed in this light, the value of faith may be too high to admit of comparison with anything else. I make no effort to settle its sublime importance. I have no objection to any effort you may make to exalt and dignify faith. It is only when in making this effort you seek to depreciate baptism that I object. Depress nothing by unauthorized comparisons, and we are agreed.

I now proceed to present you with a passage which I hold implies that baptism is for remission of sins. It is this: "Except a man be

born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” You know whose language this is, and the circumstance which called it forth. On these, then, I need not dwell.

I know not that you make a distinction between the Church of God and the kingdom of God. Some Baptists do; others do not. My brethren make none. We know not how to make any. God has not one thing on this earth called his church, and another called his kingdom. A man cannot be a member of the church and be out of the kingdom, nor in the kingdom, and out of the church. We enter not the church in this way, and the kingdom in that. The phrase, the kingdom of God and the Church of God, are merely different names for one and the same thing, viewed in different lights and from different points. The Christ and Messiah are different names, but still names the same person.

Now, all men are either in the kingdom of God or out of it. There is no half-way ground nor third class. This, I presume, you will admit. Indeed, I see not how you can deny it. All who are in the kingdom are children of God, and therefore, forgiven. All who are out of the kingdom are not children of God, and therefore, not forgiven. Whatever, then, makes the difference between those in the kingdom and those out of it must make the difference between the forgiven and the unforgiven. But the whole and precise difference between them is, that the one class is born again, the other is not. The simple fact, then, of being born again makes the difference between the pardoned and the unpardoned. This fact, therefore, must contain the conditions of pardon. If, now, we can ascertain the items that enter into and exhaust being born again, we have ascertained the condition of pardon; and if among these items baptism be found, then is it one of the conditions of pardon.

To be born again is one, one thing, a birth, a single process. The Christian in his whole career is the subject of three births. By the first, he enters the present life. By the second, he enters the kingdom of God. By the third, he enters the everlasting kingdom. In the first place, he is born of his parents. This is natural. In the second, he is born of water and of the Spirit. This is intermediate and spiritual. In the third, he is born from the grave, assumes his spiritual

body, and enters into the rest which remains for the children of God. It is with the second that we are just now concerned.

To be born of water and of the Spirit is not to be born twice. It is to be born once. It is one birth. Hence, to be born of the Spirit is a part of the new birth, and not the whole of it.—Just so with being born of water. It is not the whole of being born again, but merely a part of it.

Strictly speaking, and before the birth is completed, we should say, begotten by the Spirit, and not born of it. This begetting is effected by the Spirit as the author of it. It is effected instrumentally by the truth. “Of his own will he begot us with the word of truth.” It relates to the human spirit; or, in other words, the human spirit is the subject of it; that is, undergoes all those charges which take place in the child of God prior to his birth. It is the antecedent part of the new birth, and without it there is no birth, and hence, no entrance into the kingdom of God.

To be born of water is a metaphorical expression, denoting to emerge out of it, just as to be born from the dead denotes to emerge out of the grave.—In immersion, we emerge out of the water. In no other act of the Christian’s life is water ever present, nor in any other do we emerge out of it.—Now, since to be born of water is to emerge out of it; and since we emerge out of it in baptism only, it therefore follows that, in emerging out of the water in baptism, we are born of water. Baptism, then, is a part of the new birth; and the new birth makes the difference between the pardoned and the unpardoned. Therefore, baptism makes a part of the difference between the pardoned and the unpardoned. It is, consequently, a condition of pardon, and is essential, to it.—All this is implied in the language—“Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” With this I close my present argument.

Very fraternally yours,

Moses E Lard

## LETTER 4.

The passage on which I founded my third argument is the following:

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

Without some qualification it is not correct to say of one passage of Scripture that it is more important than another. But it is certainly true of some passages that they are more important than others in the decision of certain questions, their importance in such cases depending on their pertinency to the question in hand, and their force in deciding it. Accordingly, in deciding the terms upon which the remission of sins is to be enjoyed, no more important passage can be adduced than the one now in hand. It speaks to the question of remission intentionally, clearly, decisively. Had I not another passage in the Bible upon the subject, I should still insist that this passage alone forever fixes the value of baptism by the establishment of an inseparable connection between it and remission of sins. I fear not to go before the world and stake the entire issue between us and those who differ from us, respecting the design of baptism, upon this single passage. I emphasized its value in the present controversy, and solicit for it your especial attention.

Now, I affirm that this passage teaches that baptism, with repentance, is for—that is, is necessary to— remission of sins; that it makes remission depend on baptism in precisely the same sense in which it makes it depend on repentance; and that a connection is thus established between them of a nature so permanent that remission is in all cases (previous exceptions aside) consequent on baptism and never precedes it.

It will not be denied that the connection here contended for is possible. It is certainly competent for our heavenly Father to make remission depend on baptism in the most absolute sense. Since, then, the connection is not impossible, the question, *Does it exist?* Is fairly open for discussion; and, since it is a question of fact, it is



susceptible of proof precisely as is any other question of fact in the Bible.

But let it be determined—1st., whether the form of speech employed to express this connection, supposing it to exist, is, in the judgment of critics, adequate to that purpose; 2d., whether it is a form of speech well-established, or of frequent occurrence in the New Testament. The form of speech to which I refer is the use of the Greek particle *eis*, to express that an act or acts is performed for—i.e., in order to—some end or object; and the presence of an accusative case to express what that end or object is. But is this form of speech adequate to this purpose? That it is so, we shall consider established by the following testimonies:

1. “*Eis*, followed by an accusative, in almost innumerable instances designates the object or end for which anything is, or is done.”—Prof. M. Stuart.
2. “*Eis*, the design intended and the event produced are also expressed by this preposition.”—W. Trollope, of Pembroke College, Cambridge.

The literal, or rather, primary meaning of *eis*, it is proper to state, is into, a meaning confined chiefly to verbs of motion—the motion being directed into some thing or some place. But the sense of the passage now in hand forbids this meaning. For, first, if the particle be taken literally, the passage is not intelligible, or, at best, has a very uncertain meaning. Second, it belongs to a class of passages in which the particle signifies not into, but in order to, expressing the end or object for which something is done. Evidence for what is here said will be furnished in the course of the present argument.

But is this form of speech of frequent occurrence or well-established in the New Testament? That it is so, I shall now proceed to exemplify by actual instances. Of each of these I shall quote no more than will be necessary; and, in order to indicate the exact meaning of the particle, I shall, in each case, translate it, together with a few of the words which immediately follow it. Let the reader bear in mind that what I am now at is, to show that *eis* is

employed to express the design of an act, or that for which it is performed.

1. And, behold, the whole city came out in order to (*eis*) a meeting with Jesus.

2. Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, there shall also this, that this woman hath done, be told in order to (*eis*) her being remembered.

3. And they took counsel and bought with them the potters' field, in order to (*eis*) [have] a burying- place for strangers.

4. This is my body which is given for you: this do in order to (*eis*) my being remembered.

5. By whom we have received grace and apostleship in order to (*eis*) [induce] the obedience of faith among all nations.

6. I long to see you, that I may impart to you some spiritual gift in order to (*eis*) your being established.

7. Submit yourselves to governors as to them that are sent by the Lord in order to (*eis*) punish evildoers.

8. This is my blood which is shed in order to (*eis*) remission of sins.

9. And John came into all the country about the Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance in order to (*eis*) remission of sins.

10. Repent ye, therefore, and be converted in order to (*eis*) the blotting out of your sins.

These, though only a few from a large number of passages all belonging to the same class, are quite sufficient to show that this is a common and well-established form of speech in the New Testament.

But does the passage now in hand belong to this class?

I reply, It does; and that this is shown by a circumstance which renders it absolutely certain. In order to present the most distinct view of this circumstance, and at the same time to exhibit the dependent clauses of the passage in immediate connection with one another, let me omit, first, the clause, “in the name of Jesus Christ,” when the passage (leaving the particle untranslated) will read thus:—“Repent and be baptized, every one of you, *eis* remission of sins.” Next, let me transpose the first two clauses of the passage, when it will stand thus:—“Every one of you repent and be baptized, *eis* remission of sins.” Last, let me omit the expression, “be baptized,” which will neither affect the form of speech nor the sense of the particle, when we shall have, “Every one of you repent *eis* remission of sins”; or translating the particle, Every one of you repent, in order to (*eis*) remission of sins. From this there cannot be a dissenting voice. No expression but “in order to,” or the word “for” in the sense of “in order to,” will express the meaning of the particle. Here now, the relation between repentance and remission of sins is clearly seen. Remission of sins is seen to depend on repentance, or repentance to be necessary to remission. Now, this relation is precisely the circumstance which determines to what class the passage belongs—namely, to that class in which *eis* signifies “in order to”—i.e., necessarily, and in which consequently, it can signify nothing else.

But does not the presence of the term “be baptized,” except the passage from this class? We shall see. The audience were commanded to do two things:—repent and be baptized—These two things are related to a third—remission of sins; and, whatever that relation is, it is of necessity one, for there is but one particle to express it, which, in the same place, cannot express two relations. Consequently, whatever relation repentance bears to remission of sins, baptism bears to it. Hence, the presence of the term, “be baptized” does not except the passage from the class.

Since, therefore, the relation which repentance bears to remission of sins determines the passage to belong to that class in which *eis* signifies “in order to,” and in which it can signify nothing else, and, since the presence of the term, “be baptized” does not except the passage from that class, it follows that the true intent and

meaning of the passage is, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to (*eis*) remission of sins."

Finally, I conclude, from the grounds now before me, that the relation of baptism to remission of sins is such that baptism, like repentance, is necessary to remission; or that remission depends on baptism in precisely the same sense in which it depends on repentance. And, if there is either value in criticism, or reliance to be placed on argument, the conclusion is indisputable.

But let me suppose this position to be denied, and that it is maintained that baptism sustains to remission the relation of a subsequent to a former act, and what follows? Clearly, that repentance likewise sustains to remission the relation of a subsequent to a former act. But this proves too much, and hence is false. But I wish to exhibit this position, together with its consequences, even to the eye, and, in order to do so, will again have recourse to the passage, from which, after transposing the clauses as before, I will first omit the word "repent," thus:—"Every one of you be baptized (*eis*) because your sins are remitted." This is exactly the position of our opponents—a tough one, truly. But let me [for the sake of argument] grant that it is true, or rather, that I have at last hit on the true meaning of the particle, and that it is unalterable.—I will now place the word "repent:"—"Every one of you repent and be baptized *eis* remission of sins." Is the meaning of the particle now altered? Of course not. Let us then bring out its meaning:—"Every one of you repent and be baptized (*eis*) because your sins are remitted"; or, transposing the terms, "Be baptized and repent (*eis*) because your sins are remitted"; plainly, "Repent because your sins are remitted." How absurd this result of false criticism and false reasoning has never yet been fairly met and honorably disposed of by even one of our opponents. Indeed, it cannot be.

It was formerly stated that if *eis* be taken literally, the present passage is either not intelligible, or has a very uncertain sense, and that consequently, a different acceptation of the particle is required. This becomes apparent by simply inserting its literal meaning, thus:—Repent and be baptized, every one of you, into

(*eis*) remission of sins. What can anyone collect from the expression, repent into remission? If to English ears it has any meaning at all, it certainly is a most vague and uncertain one. Nor does the expression, "be baptized into remission," yield a sense in any respect better. Even conceding (what is doubtful) that the sense of the passage might be collected from the primary meaning of the particle, still, this is not the sense in which the Holy Spirit intended it to be taken, and hence, is not the sense which is most easily defended.

Very fraternally yours,

Moses E. Lard.

## LETTER 5.

As the basis for my fourth argument, I subjoin the following:

And now, why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord (Acts 22:16).

Candidly, it would seem to be useless to do more than merely quote this passage. To misunderstand it may not be impossible; but how its import is to be rendered more obvious by comment, it is difficult to see. Still, the passage is too important to be merely quoted and then dismissed.

There is no diversity of opinion between you and me in regard to the character of the act which Paul was commanded to perform. We both agree that his baptism was real, not metaphorical. Nor will you deny that the term "sins" has here its accustomed sense. These points, then, I dismiss at once. Consequently, the only remaining question to be settled is, what is the meaning of the expression "wash away?" or, still more pertinently, what connection, if any, does it express between baptism and remission of sins?

That the expression is metaphorical is granted. Sins are not washed away; they are remitted. Upon this no controversy can arise. But what is there in the expression to indicate or suggest this? The term rendered "wash away" is, in the original, a strong compound verb, which in its simple form denotes to wash merely. Here, however, it is compounded with a particle which signifies "from," denoting the separation of one thing from another, and which has its force represented in the expression by the term "away." Hence, in its compound form the verb signifies, not to wash simply, but to separate one thing from another by washing. It implies a separation, and expresses how it is effected. This much I believe you will readily grant.

First, then, the term implies a separation: and this is indeed the radical conception in remission. For not only does the term "remit," in its underived or Latin form, as well as in English, signify to "send away," "send from," or "let go" (in which evidently the conception of separation is essentially involved), but such, also, is the exact

meaning of the Greek word which “remit” translates. Indeed, how one thing can be washed away from another, without being separated from it, is not conceivable. Hence, we conclude that separation— i.e., of sins or remission — is the radical conception in the expression — the thing for which it stands.

Second: But not only does the expression imply a separation, it expresses how it is effected — namely, by a washing. Separation is its radical, unfigurative meaning, the thing it denotes: and the metaphor consists in this: — that the separation is represented as effected by, or depending on, a washing, which, it is hardly necessary to add, consisted in being baptized.

But this view, in effect, represents Paul as being commanded to be baptized, and thereby to separate himself from his sins. Nor can the view be deemed far from correct when it is remembered that *apolousai* is middle, and is hence to be construed as having this force. But how is it that a person can separate himself from his sins, when in reality they are separated from him, or remitted, as an act of mercy, by our heavenly Father? Clearly, by complying with the conditions, and in this way alone, on which the separation depends.

Since, therefore, the conception which lies at the very bottom of the expression in hand is *separation*, and since this is the radical idea in remission, we conclude that the exact and full force of the passage is, “Arise, and be baptized, and thereby separate yourself from your sins — put them away”; or (which is evidently the sense), “Arise and be baptized, and your sins shall be remitted.”

But perhaps a similar expression — similar, because metaphorical and of the same signification — may assist us in understanding the language of Ananias. That the expressions blot out and wash away sins have exactly the same import, you will not deny. The only distinction between them is that what is represented by the one as being blotted out is represented by the other as being washed away. They do not represent different things, but express the same thing differently. Now, when Peter in Solomon's porch said to the people, “Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out,” metaphor aside, what did he mean? Obviously, “Repent and be

converted, that your sins may be remitted.” Precisely thus, then, must we interpret the expression “wash away thy sins”— namely, “Arise, and be baptized, and your sins shall be remitted.” The two expressions are identical in sense, their interpretation the same.

When we view baptism as a condition on which remission of sins depends, we have no difficulty in understanding the language of Ananias. Paul’s sins were not remitted before his baptism. Hence, Ananias commanded him to be baptized and wash them away. But when he complied, then God, for Christ’s sake, remitted them; and, because the remission was made dependent on the baptism, the sins remitted are represented as being washed away in it. This, to a person of your candor and good sense, can hardly be said to admit of dispute.

When, on a subsequent occasion, Paul said to the Philippian jailer, “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved,” you can have no difficulty in discovering the intimate dependence of salvation on belief. Nor can you deny the conditional nature of belief. Yet you can see no more natural fitness in it to procure remission than you can in the act of being baptized. When, then, Ananias says to Paul, Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, do you see no dependence of remission on baptism; can you see in it nothing which renders it necessary, even as a condition, to remission? These questions I leave to your own honest heart.

But, excuse me, my dear sir. Let me suppose your theory of remission, if I understand it aright, to be correct. Paul’s sins, then, were remitted the instant he believed, and consequently before his baptism. At that time, therefore, his sins had no existence whatever. They were simply a nonentity. Indeed, he had no sins— hence, none to be remitted, none to be washed away, none to be disposed of in any sense. And yet Ananias, the Lord’s special messenger, is represented as saying to him, “Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins”! Did Ananias, I ask you in the name of truth, command Paul to be baptized, and wash away his sins, when absolutely he had not one sin remaining? To these questions, I feel sure, you will give the attention which their significance demands.

Very respectfully yours,



Moses E. Lard

## LETTER 6.

My fifth argument will be based on the following:

Wherein [the ark] few, that is eight, souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us — not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God (1 Peter 3:20-21).

This passage (so exceedingly obscure in the form here cited) is susceptible of being made much more intelligible by rendering it a little freely, thus:

In which (ark) a few, that is eight, souls were saved by water, which also now saves us in its antitype, baptism, which consists not in putting away fleshly impurity, but in seeking a good conscience in God.

This rendering, which is admitted to be free, is according to one of the best texts of the Greek New Testament extant. A few additional remarks, however, explanatory of it, will not be out of place.

According to the common text, “antitype” is the subject of the verb “saves.” This, however, is now regarded as incorrect; and the true subject is held to be the relative pronoun *ho*. Such is the case in the text now before me. With this relative, “antitype” is an apposition, and “baptism” with “antitype”; and, although a somewhat unusual apposition, yet it is attended with no ambiguity. The relative is in the neuter gender, agreeing with “water” as its antecedent — the only noun in the sentence with which it can agree.

The terms rendered “putting away” and “seeking” are both in the nominative case, and, since no verb is expressed, of course to or after one understood. That this is the verb “is,” hardly admits of doubt. It is not necessary, however, in order to express the sense of the passage, to be so slavishly literal as to indicate these circumstances. Hence, in my rendering, I have not done so.

But on what ground have I substituted the word “seeking” for the word “answer”? I reply, first, there is a necessity for it; for the pas-

sage, as it now stands in the common version, conveys no intelligible meaning whatever; indeed, it is simply a jumble of words without meaning. Second, it agrees better with the sense of the original term. The verb from which the original term is derived occurs in the Greek New Testament fifty-nine times, in fifty-five of which it is rendered either by the word “ask” or by some of its forms; in two, “demanded”; in one, “desired”; and in one, “questioned”; and in every single case should have been rendered either by “ask” or by some of its forms. “To seek after” is given as one of the meanings of the verb, in the best lexicon to the Greek Testament I have yet seen. Hence, the noun, retaining substantially the same sense, must mean either an asking or a seeking; and, since “seeking” gives a clearer and better sense, I therefore decide in its favor. “Asking” is applicable rather to persons than to things; hence it is better to say of baptism, it is a seeking than an asking.

But why substitute “in” for “towards”? I answer, because it gives a clearer sense and accords better with the usage of the Greek particle. That it gives a clearer sense is obvious at a glance, and hence needs no further illustration. The particle in the Greek is *eis*, which seems to have the sense (*en*) in: not that *eis* is used for *en*; but there appears to be the idea of previous motion combined with a state of rest, in which case *eis* has the force of *en*. The following is an instance of this usage: “And, leaving Nazareth, he came and dwelt in (*eis*) Capernaum.” In such cases the previous motion is, by the best critics, supposed to have suggested the use of *eis*; the real force of the passage being, “And, leaving Nazareth, he came into (*eis*) Capernaum, and dwelt there.” Again, the passage itself in hand supplies an instance of the usage. Noah entered into (previous motion) the ark; hence he is represented as having been saved in (*eis*) it. In the same manner, the previous use of baptism seems to have suggested the use of *eis*, which we have rendered “in” instead of “towards.” We are baptized into (*eis*) Christ; hence in him we are all said to be one. We are baptized into (*eis*) the name of the Father; hence we dwell in (*en*) him. Consequently, since it is by baptism that we enter into him, it would seem highly proper to represent it as consisting in seeking a good conscience in (*eis*) him, especially when we have full authority for such a use of the particle.

The preceding view of the passage has at least this advantage — that it is perfectly intelligible, as well as consistent with what we know to be taught elsewhere; and although it is here rather suggested than insisted on, still, I believe it possessed of a high degree of certainty.

But all this has little to do with my argument. The ground on which it rests is asserted in the common version — namely, "Baptism doth also now save us." From this it is clear that there is a sense in which baptism saves us, or a salvation which depends on or is effected in and by baptism. The question is, *What is it, or in what does it consist?* First, it cannot be salvation in its most comprehensive sense; for it is limited to baptism. Second, it is not, be it what it may, a partial, but a complete salvation; for baptism "now saves us." Hence, previously to baptism it does not exist; subsequently it does: but without baptism it cannot exist. What, now, is the safest and fairest method of ascertaining in what it consists, or since the passage asserts the fact that baptism saves us, how shall we determine in what sense?

Clearly, the best method of obtaining a correct reply to this question is to ascertain in what sense the word "saved" is used when used in connection with baptism, or what is therein accomplished to which the word is applicable. Happily, this is an easy task: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." Jointly, these passages determine, definitely and conclusively, that the word "saved," when used in connection with baptism, is used to denote remission of sins; and whatever meaning it certainly has in these passages, it certainly has in every other precisely similar passage, and, consequently, in the present one. Hence, baptism doth also now save us, because therein our sins are remitted. Of the truth of this, little doubt can remain, when it is remembered that the same apostle on whose language I am now commenting commanded an audience to repent and be baptized in order to remission of sins. Hence, it may with great propriety be represented that baptism consists in seeking a good conscience in God, because it consists in seeking a conscience freed from sin.

Will you, kind sir, now allow me, in the conclusion of this argument, to recite the several passages on which I have commented for your sake, and ask you a few questions? This I do with no vain wish to perplex you, but to elicit from you that candid decision which I believe you can, and hope you will, render:

1. John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. (Mark 1:4).

*In this case what was the baptism of repentance for? To what end did it look?*

2. And He said unto them, “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned” (Mark 16:15-16).

*On what two things does salvation here depend? Is baptism one of them?*

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

*What two things did Peter command his audience to do? Did he command them to do these two things for remission of sins? Is baptism one of the things commanded?*

4. And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord (Acts 22:16).

*What did Ananias command Paul to do? Did he command him to wash away his sins? In what act?*

Fraternally, yours,

Moses E. Lard

## LETTER 7.

The passage on which I make my sixth argument is the following:

“According to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit.”

In regard to the expression “renewing of the Holy Spirit,” there exists, I believe, little diversity of opinion. With one consent, it and the expression “begotten by the Spirit” are allowed to be identical in sense. If they are not, the distinction between them may be said to be this — that “begotten by the Spirit” expresses the fact simply, while the other is rather descriptive of it, being a renewing. Certainly, he who is begotten is renewed, and equally certain is it that he who is renewed is begotten.

Of this effect or renewing the Holy Spirit is the author; hence, it is called a renewing of — i.e., effected by — the Spirit. It commences in the enlightenment of the mind, and results in a deep and earnest faith in Jesus Christ. It comprehends all between the entrance of the first ray of heavenly light into the mind of the sinner and his first overt act of obedience. It is a renewing of the sinner in the inner man, the effects of which become apparent in his outward conduct; and, without it, no act which he can perform can be truly styled an act of obedience. Its importance cannot be too weightily emphasized, nor can too much zeal be shown in urging the truth upon the sinner’s attention through which it is effected.

But what is the meaning of the expression “washing of regeneration”? That it refers to baptism, or is another and descriptive name for it, is almost universally conceded. This much, then, we might fairly take for granted. But this is not the question. The question is not what does it refer to, but what is its meaning? On this point nothing is allowed to be taken for granted; but why? Is it because the expression has an uncertain meaning? This is not the reason. Is it because its structure is so involved as to hide its meaning? Not at all. Or is it an unusual form of speech, which refuses to yield its sense by the common laws of language? By no means. *It contains a meaning which, to many, I regret to say, is not acceptable. This is the reason.*

The only difficulty in the expression seems to lie in deciding whether the washing named in it belongs to regeneration as an integral part of it, and therefore as *essential* to it, or whether it is a washing *subsequent* to regeneration, and hence no part of it — in a word, the washing of a person already and completely regenerated. Those who adopt the latter view separate the expression, making the term washing refer to one thing, and the term regeneration to another; while those who adopt the former view regard the whole expression as only a complex name for baptism, and hence as inseparable; and this view I think to be unquestionably the correct one. For, if the expression be separated, to what, first, refers the word “washing”? To baptism, respond the talent and learning of Christendom. From this there is hardly a dissenting voice. But to what, second, refers the term “regeneration”? To this absolutely no answer can be given. It cannot refer to being begotten by the Spirit, for this is expressed by the clause renewing of the Holy Spirit; it cannot refer to baptism, for this is represented by the word washing. Indeed, according to this view, it is simply an unmeaning redundancy with neither sense in it nor reason for its presence.

But a little attention to the structure of the expression, especially to its sense, will assure us not only that it is not separable, but that the term “regeneration ” is a mere epithet, serving to qualify the preceding word “washing.” And this is according to the following well-known principle in the Greek language: Nouns in the genitive case are often used in the sense of adjectives to express the qualities of both persons and things. This is clearly the principle according to which the expression is to be resolved or cleared of difficulty. The following instances are subjoined as illustrative of the principle. It is proper to state, however, that the principle, not being of universal application, is to be applied with caution:

1. Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief. —Here the word “unbelief” is, in the original, in the genitive, and is correctly represented in English by an adjective, thus: An evil unbelieving heart. And so of the remaining instances.
2. And I say to you, Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness — the unrighteous mammon.

3. For this cause God gave them up to vile affections— affections of vileness, in the Greek..
4. When ye, therefore, shall see the abomination of desolation. — the desolating abomination.
5. And the lord commended the unjust steward—in the original, steward of injustice.
6. But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer — in the Greek, a hearer of forgetfulness.
7. Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances — in the original, ordinances of flesh.
8. The prince of the power of the air, the Spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience—the disobedient children.

But these instances are enough. Now, precisely as the genitive is used in these instances is it used in the expression now in hand, thus: “According to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration” — or, converting the term “regeneration” into an adjective, “a regenerating washing—and the renewing of the Holy Spirit.”

By the phrase “regenerating washing,” is not meant a washing which implants any holy principle in the heart, or which, in any other way, morally affects the inner man; but merely a washing which completes the new birth. The epithet “regenerating” is objectionable, I grant, for the reason that it is liable to be misconstrued. It is here, however, employed merely to illustrate the principle and for the want of a better term.

That the conclusion just arrived at is correct may be inferred, further, from the ambiguity of the expression “washing of regeneration.” This may be invariably set down as decisive against the correctness of a rendering. Not that a rendering can be inferred to be correct from its not being ambiguous; but, from its being ambiguous, its incorrectness may be certainly inferred. That the expression is ambiguous is evident from the uncertain import of the parti-



cle — of—which it contains. First, it may mean a washing effected by regeneration; or, second, a washing belonging to it as part of it; or, third, a washing performed on it—i. e., the subjects of it. The particle of has all these acceptations in the following expressions: The mark of a pen — something effected by it; the point of a pen — something belonging to it as a part of it; the mending of a pen — an act performed on it. This is enough to show that the expression is ambiguous. Hence, I infer the preceding to be the true meaning of the passage.

But to what is reference made in the word “saved,” or to what does it properly apply? First, it is clear that it refers to a salvation then past, then completed. Hence, the apostle could speak of it as a matter of history. Second, that it is the salvation which occurred when Paul ceased to be “foolish, disobedient, deceived,” etc. Third, that it is the salvation which depends on the renewing of the Holy Spirit, and is the first which happens after it. But what is this but the remission of sins? This, then, I conclude, is the reference in the word, or the thing to which it applies. But this salvation depended not alone on the renewing of the Holy Spirit. For he saved us by the washing of regeneration, one thing, and the renewing of the Holy Spirit, another. Hence, the washing of regeneration — or baptism — is essential to the remission of sins, or is one of the conditions on which it depends.

All of which I most respectfully submit to your candor and good sense.

Fraternally, yours,

Moses E. Lard

## LETTER 8.

With my present article I propose to close my reply to your inquiry. I believe you will not feel that sufficient attention has not been given to your question. I have aimed to be full, but not prolix [long-winded]; brief, but not obscure. A mere summary would have been unsatisfactory; a treatise was out of the question. That more might be said on the question you well know, but whether to much profit I doubt. With what is now before you and what herein follows you must form your judgment. Mainly on the grounds now assigned do we hold immersion, in the case of the believing penitent, to be for remission of sins. That our faith is well-based, we have a profound conviction. You may think differently. This I should regret. I have still one more argument to present, of the class which implies that baptism is for remission. It rests on the following passage:

“For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to promise.”

Certainly, the expression “in Christ” is not to be taken literally; and yet there can exist no doubt as to its import or the relation which it expresses. Now, I maintain that the very fact that we enter into Christ by baptism, into the relation which this language expresses, involves the connection between baptism and the remission of sins for which I contend. The distinction between being in Christ and out of Christ is a broad distinction. It is not imaginary, but real. The terms used to express it are not idle terms. They have a deep, divine significance. Will you pause, courteous sir, and tell me what it is? Do not you claim to be in Christ, and do not you regard this claim as implying the remission of your sins? The time was when you did not thus claim. Were you then pardoned? A thoughtful answer to these questions will impress you with the distinction on which I am here insisting. If to be out of Christ and in Christ are the same, or if to be in Christ is no better than to be out of him, then you will please consider my present argument as futile. To be

in Christ — is this the same as being in the kingdom, in the church, as being sound? If not, what is it? But I will not weary you with questions.

That the instant in which a person becomes an “heir according to promise,” he becomes a Christian, or is forgiven, can hardly be supposed to admit of argument. To suppose a person an “heir” and yet not forgiven, or forgiven and yet not an heir, involves a contradiction, if not in words, at least in fact. But when do we become heirs? The reply is, when we become Abraham’s children; not according to the flesh certainly, but when we are constituted such. But when do we become Abraham’s children? Certainly when we become Christ’s; and we become Christ’s when in him, *and not before*. For, says the Apostle, you are all one in Christ, and, if Christ’s (which you are if in him), then are you Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to promise.

Now, what persons alone are in Christ? As many, is the reply, as have been baptized into Christ, and not one more. If now, none out of Christ are forgiven, and if all in him are, then the very act of entering into him makes the difference between the forgiven and the unforgiven person. If there is any value in implication, this is conclusive.

Again, out of Christ alone do the distinctions exist between Jew and Greek, bond and free, male and female. Now, not for a moment can it be doubted that the instant in which these distinctions cease to exist is the instant in which we are forgiven. These are worldly distinctions, and cease to exist only when we cease to be of the world, which happens the instant in which we are forgiven. Now, that the instant in which these distinctions cease to exist is the instant in which we are baptized into Christ, is positively certain. Hence, hardly less certain is it that in that instant we are forgiven. When we cross the line out of the world into the Kingdom we cease to be Jew, cease to be Gentile; and when we cease to be these, we cease to be children of the wicked one, and become children of God. But we never cease to be Jew and Gentile till we enter Christ, and we never enter him till baptized into him. Then,

therefore, do we cease to be children of Satan and become children of God.

But to this you will reply that we also believe into Christ as well as are baptized into him. I grant it, and cordially believe it. It is not, then, by baptism alone that we enter him, neither is it by faith alone, but by the two jointly and inseparably. There is here, then, neither contradiction nor antagonism. When it is said we believe into Christ, this must be construed as not excluding baptism; and when it is said we are baptized into Christ, this must be construed as not excluding faith. Both are necessary, and neither can be excluded or omitted. I leave you to notice how closely this agrees with the declaration, "he that believes and is immersed shall he saved." If we are saved we are in Christ; and if we have believed and been baptized we are saved. Hence it is by both belief and baptism that we are saved, and by belief and baptism that we enter into Christ. More I believe you will not expect me to say on this point.

In conclusion, my dear sir, permit me to express the pleasure I have had in preparing these imperfect articles for your eye. That you have read them in the same tranquil and fraternal spirit in which they have been penned, I do not for a moment doubt. I have written them in the fear of God and in the love of the truth; and beyond honoring Him and defending this, I am not conscious of an ambition in my breast. Accept my fondest wish for your peace in time and your happiness in eternity.

Fraternally and truly yours.

Moses E. Lard.