

BY

SPRINKLING



PENTECOSTAL PUBLISHING CO.
Louisville, Kentucky

JOHN R. CHURCH, D. D.
General Evangelist of The Methodist Church

1849 Ardmore Road
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

INTRODUCTION

The topic discussed by the author would appear to many outmoded, out-of-date, uninteresting and unimportant. There are multiplied thousands of people, however, who literally base their salvation upon their mode of baptism. If they would read this book with care, it would astonish, enlighten and bless them.

Dr. Church approaches the subject in a fair manner. He deals with it scholarly and brotherly. He shows the reasonableness of the Wesleyan position on the subject and very adequately throws the burden of proof on the other group.

The Old Testament background for the practice of baptism is clearly brought forth. The reason for and the methods of those ceremonies which became a basis for New Testament baptism are clearly revealed. The arguments of the strict immersionists are taken up one by one, and the false position of the advocates of that one type of baptism is revealed from the viewpoint of argument, Scripture, and practical application. The scriptural interpretations are very concise.

"How Was Jesus Baptized?" The discussion of this portion of the book is worth the effort of the author to write it; is worth the time of any person it VU take to read it; and is worth whatever price will sells for. The same thing could be said on the division of "Some Arguments From Common Sense."

You will enjoy reading this book. It will enlighten you; it will interest you; it will bless you.

Z. T. JOHNSON

President of Asbury College.

Table of contents

1. Forward	5
2. The Old Testament Background	14
3. Study of Arguments Presented by Immerionists	19
a. Meaning of Greek word Baptizo	19
b. Buried with Christ in Baptism	35
c. Going down into ... straight way up out of	40
d. Following our Lord in Baptism	41
4. How was Jesus Baptized	42
5. Some New Testament cases of Baptism	56
6. Some Arguments from Common Sense	65
7. Appendix ... New Testament Greek	73
a. Questions for your Consideration	75
b. Is Water Baptism Essential to Salvation?	75
c. One Faith, One Lord, One Baptism	79
d. Water Baptism & Spirit Baptism are not the same ..	82

FOREWORD

There was a time, in the history of the Christian church when there was a great deal of wrangling and disputing over the proper mode of Christian baptism. This caused a great deal of hard feelings and led to an unchristian attitude on the part of many who engaged in such debate. I thank God that in a large measure this has passed away, and today most people take a more charitable attitude toward those who may differ with them on this subject. I trust that the time will never come in the Christian church when such a condition will prevail again.

Certainly I would not be guilty of wilfully doing anything to help bring such a spirit back into the ranks of God's people. I would not deliberately, for anything in this world, do anything that would stir up strife and discord. I have nothing but the kindest of feelings for those who teach and practice the mode of baptism by immersion. I have many very dear friends in their ranks, and love them with all my heart. I am perfectly willing for them to practice the mode of baptism that seems best to them. I feel that every person ought to be baptized in the way he thinks is right. I believe that every one ought to be satisfied in his own heart and mind. As Peter says, "Baptism is an answer to a good conscience," and I feel that every one ought to be satisfied in his own mind. I have baptized a number of people by immersion, and will gladly baptize anyone else in that way, if they so desire.

As you no doubt know, the Methodist Church practices baptism by either one of the three modes. We will either baptize by sprinkling, pouring or immersion. We want the candidate to be satisfied in his own heart and mind. We take this attitude not because we are indifferent or unconcerned about doing things as they should be done. It is not due to laxness or indifference on our part, but we are convinced

FOREWORD

in our own minds that either mode is real baptism in the true sense of the word baptize, as it is used in the New Testament. We believe that the word, as it is used in the New Testament, means ceremonial cleansing, regardless of how it might be done. We believe that if a person is either baptized by sprinkling, pouring or immersion he is really baptized in the New Testament sense of the word.

Now unfortunately our good friends, who contend for immersion as the only true scriptural mode of baptism, will not take this liberal position. They contend that there is only one true mode of baptism, and that is by immersion; and they contend that if you have not been baptized in that way you have not been baptized at all. If they are right in their position then of course we are wrong, and ought to forsake our practices and only baptize by immersion. If we are right in our position then our good friends, who contend for immersion alone, are wrong, and they ought to forsake their position. Really there is no middy ground that can be taken on this subject. Either we are right and they are wrong, or they are right and we are wrong.

Now as I have said before, I would not do anything to stir up strife and cause division in the ranks of God's people. However, after saying this, I want to say that it is my earnest and honest conviction that we as Methodists have done our people a great injustice by not telling them why we believe in and practice baptism as we do. We have asked our people to accept baptism by effusion (sprinkling or pouring) and have in many instances never told them why we practice these modes. There are man people in the Methodist Church today, who have no clear cut conception as to why they have been baptized by affusion. They have submitted to it, but have no idea why we do it in that way. Our good immersionist friends preach often and earnestly on why they

FOREWORD

practice immersion, and most of their people are well indoctrinated on this subject. On the other hand, we have many people who could not give you any intelligent reason as to why they were baptized by effusion. I feel that this is unfair to our people. I feel that we ought to tell them why we do things as we do. They are entitled to know if they are to accept baptism in the way we do it. I have met many people who have left our church and went to some other church for no reason other than that they became upset about the question of baptism. I am firmly convinced in my own mind that if they had been instructed as they should have been, they would be in our church today and would be happy and satisfied. our good immersionist friends do not hesitate to emphasize their views on the subject of water baptism, so why should we? They ought to be willing to grant us the same privilege that they take for themselves, and ought not to feel hard toward us when we set forth our views.

In fact I feel that we have not only done our own people an injustice in keeping quiet on this subject, but I feel we have done our good iminersionist friends an injustice also. I have met many good people in churches that insist on baptism by immersion only, and many of them seem to have the feeling that we have absolutely no scriptural ground for our practice, but that we just do it for convenielice, or because some Pope passed a decree that it should be done in that way. We owe it to them to give them our reasons for doing it as we do, and then let them weigh the evidence and see if we are right in our teaching.

It is with this purpose in mind that we have undertaken this little treatise on this subject. We are not trying to stir up strife or to change other people in their views. We are only setting forth the reasons for our practice and let you weigh the evidence. We are willing to live and let live, and to extend the right hand of fellowship to all that love and serve our Lord

FOREWORD

Jesus Christ. We can say, "Is thy heart right as my heart is right, if so give me thy hand?"

I trust that I am free from sectarianism and denominational prejudices. I trust that I have a feeling of love and Christian charity for all of God's children, regardless of whether they may agree with me on all points. I feel that the question of the proper mode of baptism has its place and is of some importance. I believe that when our Lord commands us to do a thing, we ought to try and find out how it should be done. When we do know how it should be done then we ought to do it in that way. If immersion is the only way it should be done, then by all means we should immerse every person Who comes into the church. On the other hand, if the Bible teaches that some other mode is proper, then we ought to know what the Bible really teaches on the subject.

We do not believe that water baptism is essential to salvation. We believe and teach that we are saved by grace through faith. We are not saved by baptism, but are baptized as a testimony to the world that we are saved. Just as Abraham believed God and it was imputed unto him for righteousness, so we believe Christ and are saved by faith in Him. Abraham was circumcised not in order to be saved, but rather as a testimony to his salvation. The same is true of baptism today. We are baptized, not in order to be saved, but rather as a testimony to the fact that we are saved.

Of course we are aware of the fact that some people teach that baptism is essential to salvation, and they go to that passage in John 3:5 where it says. "Except a man be born of *water* and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." However, want to say emphatically that Jesus is not speaking of water baptism in this passage. The subject of water baptism is not mentioned in this whole discourse. When Jesus speaks of being born of water in this place,

FOREWORD

he is speaking of natural birth. Anyone that knows anything about the birth of a child knows that it is born in water, if it isn't, then the child dies and usually the mother dies also. Jesus is really saying here, that you must not only be born naturally, (that is of water) but you must also be born of the Spirit in order to become a child of God. He points out why this is true in the very next verse. He says, "That which is born of the flesh (water) * is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must *be born* again."

To make this mean water baptism would mean that water baptism was absolutely essential to salvation, and would certainly put Jesus in a tight place. When Jesus went home with Zaccheus he said, "This day is salvation come to this house." He did not say, "When this man has been baptized he will have salvation," but he said he had it then and there. To make water baptism essential to salvation would rule the thief on the cross out of the kingdom of God, for he was never baptized and yet Jesus said unto him, "Verily, I say unto thee, today shalt thou be with me in paradise." To make water baptism essential to salvation would certainly put St. Paul on the spot, for he wrote to the church at Corinth and said, I Corinthians 1:14, 17, "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius; For God sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." Now if water baptism was absolutely essential to salvation, then certainly St. Paul knew it; and if Paul knew it was essential to salvation, then certainly he would not be thanking God, that he had failed to do a thing that is absolutely necessary to get

* Not only does medical science teach us that a child is born in water, but it also teaches us that about 78 percent of the human body is water. Jesus, therefore, was sound in his teaching from the standpoint of science when he speaks of being born in water in speaking of natural birth.

FOREWORD

a person into the kingdom of God. It seems to me that any thinking person can see that this is true.

Yes, baptism has its place, but it is not essential to salvation. As St. Peter says, "It cannot put away the filth of the flesh, but it is the answer of a good conscience toward God." We ought to be baptized and in the proper way, but we ought never to depend upon baptism to save us. Only the blood of Jesus Christ can wash away sins.

While I am not narrow and sectarian in my attitude toward other people, I am glad that I belong to that body of Christian people known as Methodists. There are several reasons why this is true. I do not have time and space to mention all the reasons why I am glad I am a Methodist, but there are two reasons that I would like to set forth in this little booklet. In the first place I want to say that I am glad I belong to that body of believers known as Methodists because of the attitude they take about the church. The Methodist Church does not make any claim to being the one and only true church. Sometimes our good friends in other churches, who make rather strong claims along this line, seem to take delight in reminding us of the fact that our church is not very old, and that it was founded by Mr. John Wesley. They seem to think that this is a reflection on us. However, we do not feel that way about it. We do not make any claims as to the matter of being the one and only true church. We are aware of the fact that there are a number of groups that do make such claims, but we don't believe they can successfully prove their claims. We do not make any such claims. In fact, strictly speaking, the Methodist Church does not even claim to be a church, let alone the one and only true church. We believe there is only one true church, and that is the spiritual church, which is the Bride of Christ, or the Body of Christ. We believe this is the only true church in the strictest sense of the word. We believe the only way you can

FOREWORD

get into this church is by the process of regeneration or the New Birth. You can't join this church, but you are baptized into it by the Spirit of God. The Lord adds to the church such as are saved by faith in Christ. If you are born of the Spirit of God you are a member of this church, regardless of what earthly organization you may belong to, and if you are not born of the Spirit of God, then you may belong to all the earthly organizations you can find, and still not be a member of the true church of Christ.

Mr. John Wesley, who was led of God in establishing the Methodist Societies, was a member of the Established Church of England at the time of his conversion, and remained in that church to the day of his death. He was an ordained minister in that Church. Mr. Wesley had no desire to start a new church, and I don't think he felt that he was starting a new church when he organized the first Methodist Societies. He organized his converts into small bands, known as societies in order to preserve the fruits of his labor, and that the people might be helped in their efforts to live the Christian life. They were small bands that were bound together by religious ties so that they might have the help that comes from the fellowship of kindred minds. Really when you join a Methodist Church today, you are joining a society of people for the purpose of getting and giving help in the Christian life. We believe that there are real children of God in all the different churches of today, and are glad to recognize them as such. I like that kind of an attitude, for it saves me time and labor in trying to prove that my little group is the one and only true church. I don't have to try and prove that, because I don't believe that it is true. I believe the one and only true church is made up of all regenerated people, and, therefore, I can say, "Is thy heart right as my heart is right, if so give me thy hand?" I am glad that I can take this position as a member of the Methodist Church.

FOREWORD

The second thing that makes me glad I am a member of the Methodist Church is the position we take on the subject of water baptism. I am glad that I do not have to contend for one and only one mode of water baptism. I am glad that I can take the position that if you have been baptized either by sprinkling, pouring, or immersion then you have been baptized in the New Testament sense of the word. I am firmly convinced in my own mind that this is the scriptural position to take, and is more in harmony with the spirit and teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ. Feeling as I do on the subject I could not take the position that immersion is the one and only true mode of baptism.*

New I am aware of the fact that there are many good, sincere people in the world who do take the other position, and cannot understand how an honest informed person could take any such position. For that reason I feel justified in setting forth my views on this subject in this little booklet entitled, "WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING?" I trust that all who may read it will be helped and not hurt. I trust that it will be read in the same Christian spirit in which it was written. It is not my desire to stir up strife and discord, but rather to make my little contribution to a better understanding of a question that has vexed the minds of so many good people. May this little booklet be used by the Master to clarify rather than to confuse. If this little booklet can be used to help someone to understand this subject better, and cause them to take a more liberal and charitable attitude on this question, then I shall be happy indeed.

We want it distinctly understood that we are not contending for baptism by sprinkling only. We believe that sprinkling, pouring or immersion is baptism, ac-

* In passing I would like to say that what has been said here of the Methodist Church, and its stand on these two points, is also true of a large number of other Christian denominations. They take the same stand.

FOREWORD

According to the way the word is used in the New Testament. In our argument that is given of course we will be putting the major emphasis on baptism by affusion (sprinkling or pouring), for this is the point at issue with our friends who disagree with us. However, we want it understood that we do recognize immersion as one of the modes of baptism. If you have been baptized by immersion then you have been baptized according to the way the word is used by our Lord Jesus. The only thing we are contending for, is that a person has just as truly been baptized, according to the use our Lord made of the word, if he has been sprinkled, or had water poured on him, as if he had been immersed. This is the heart of the whole question. This is all we are contending for, but we are contending for this. You will find our reasons given in the booklet. All we ask is that you give it a prayerful and fair reading and weigh the evidence and arrive at your own conclusion. May God bless you is our prayer.

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

THE OLD TESTAMENT BACKGROUND OF THE SUBJECT

Sometime ago I announced that I would speak on the theme we are dealing with in this book. There was a good man in the city where I was holding the meeting, and when he heard my announcement he remarked to a friend of mine that he did not see how I could prove my point unless I went back to the Old Testament for my proof. I feel that the point can be proven from the New Testament alone. However, we need to see that it is perfectly-logical for us to begin a discussion of this subject from the standpoint of the Old Testament teaching. The New Testament springs out of the Old Testament, and the New Testament is the fulfillment of the Old Testament. They supplement each other. We can never fully understand the Bible teaching on the subject of baptism, and many other subjects, unless we do go back to the Old Testament to begin.

When John the Baptist came and began to baptize the people he did it in accordance with the teaching of the Old Testament and in fulfillment of it. The scribes and Pharisees recognized this fact. They asked him, "If thou art not that prophet nor the Messiah then why do you baptize?" They had a perfect right to ask that question for there were some Old Testament prophecies that told of the time when people would be baptized in large numbers. In fact, baptism was no new thing to the Jews. If it had been then the scribes and Pharisees would have offered strong objection to it, because they were sticklers for things being done according to the law. If John had done something that was contrary to the law and the prophets, then they would have objected. However, we do not find them offering any objections to his baptism. Neither did they object to the mode that he used. The reason they did not object was because they were perfectly

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

familiar with the matter of baptism. The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews tells us that they had *divers baptisms*, Hebrews 9:10. The English has it "divers washings," but the Greek gives it "*divers baptisms*." In fact every proselyte that came into the Jewish Church was baptized. In the writings that existed before and at the time of Christ, we find a number of references to the matter of baptism. In the book of Judith (that is one of the Apocryphal books which was written in the 400 year period between the closing of the Old Testament and the coming of Christ), we find the record of how Judith went out and *baptized* herself every day for a number of days at the horse trough, in order to deceive a king. The writer of this book calls it *baptism* and it was done by sprinkling. We also find that Josephus, a great Jewish historian, who lived about the same time as Christ, used the word *baptize* in his writings, and he plainly tells us that it was done by sprinkling. I merely mention these two instances in order to point out to you that the matter of baptism was no new thing to the Jews at the time of Christ. They were perfectly familiar with the practice and looked upon it as a part of their religion. We need to keep this truth in mind if we are to have any clear understanding of the subject. John did not start something new. If he had he would have gotten into plenty of trouble with the Jews of that day.

Now, with this thought in mind, I would like to call your attention to two Old Testament prophecies that seem to shed some light on this subject. In the book of Isaiah 52:15, we find these words, "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations; the kings shall shut their mouths at him," etc. I would suggest that you begin at the thirteenth verse of this chapter and read clear on through the fifty-third chapter. As you read this passage please keep in mind the fact that when the Bible was first written it was not divided into verses and chapters. That has been done at a more recent

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

time, and, of course, the people who did it did not claim to be divinely inspired in their work. Now as you read this passage ask yourself the question, Who is the writer speaking of in this passage? There is but one answer to this question and that is Christ. The prophet is speaking by inspiration of the coming Christ and tells about his suffering and death. All Bible scholars are agreed on this. In fact the writers of the New Testament clearly verify this in the fact that they quote this passage and apply it to Christ. It was this portion that the Eunuch was reading when Phillip joined him in his chariot, and we are told that he began at this passage and preached Christ unto him. There can be no question but that Isaiah is speaking of Christ. Now please go back and notice what he says Christ will do when he comes. He says, "So shall he *sprinkle many nations.*" The Hebrew word that is translated "sprinkle" in this place is the word "*Nazah,*" and is used 24 times in the Old Testament, and every time it is translated into the English word "*sprinkle.*" So you see we have here a clear cut prophecy that when Jesus does come he will sprinkle many nations. It does not say that he will immerse them, but it does say that he will sprinkle them.

Now turn in your Bible to the book of Ezekiel 36: 25 and you will find this prophecy, "Then will I *sprinkle clean water upon you,* and ye shall be clean from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you." Here we have another clear-cut prophecy of the time when God shall begin to deal with his people, and we are plainly told that he will sprinkle clean water upon them and they shall be clean. In the days of Moses the people had water sprinkled upon them for cleansing. In Isaiah we are told that when Christ comes he will sprinkle many nations, and now in Ezekiel we are told of the time when God will sprinkle clean water upon his people to cleanse them In this I think we must see that there is at least some

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

scripture for the practice of sprinkling people with water.

As we continue this study on the subject of baptism we will have occasion to come back again to the Old Testament for evidence on this question, but in the very beginning of the study we wanted to point out to you that the whole subject gets its start in the Old Testament. The practice of baptism was no new thin, to the Jews in the days of Jesus and John the Baptist. In fact, when Jesus came to John for baptism and John hesitated to comply with his request, Jesus said, "Suffer it to be so that we fulfill all righteousness." In other words, they were fulfilling the Old Testament instruction. Jesus said, "I come not to destroy but to fulfill the law. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but not one jot nor tittle shall pass out of the word until all has been fulfilled." God had given certain instructions to his people, and Jesus and John were doing what the Old Testament prescribed. If this had not been true then there would have been strong objection to the whole thing on the part of the scribes and Pharisees. However, we do not find them offering any protest. The very fact that they were silent on the matter is proof that it was the thing that was expected to be done, and that it was done according to the law.

A careful study of the Bible will reveal that the writer of Hebrews was right when he spoke of divers (or many) baptisms. In the time of Christ the Jews were already in the habit of baptizing their hands, pots, pans, tables, couches and themselves many times each day. In Mark 7:4 we are told, "And when they come from the market, except they wash, they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the *washing* (the Greek is *baptisontai*, or baptizing) of cups, and pots, brazen vessels and of tables." We also find a reference to the customs that prevailed in the days of Jesus in the gospel of Luke 11:38, "And when the Pharisee saw it, he mar-

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

velled that he (Jesus) had not *first washed* (the Greek is *ebaptisthm* or baptized) before dinner." These two references from the gospels clearly indicate that the Jews were familiar with baptism, and that they practiced it many times in their daily life and conduct. So you see that this is not some new practice that John the Baptist started, but it was a carrying out of what was already a common practice among the Jews of that day. The word baptism had already taken on a very definite meaning in the mind of the Jews at the time of Christ.

In view of what has just been said, about these various washings or purifications it might be well for me to call your attention to a statement that we find in John's gospel which sheds some light on this matter. In John 2:6 we find this striking statement: "And there were set there six waterpots of stone, *after the manner of the purifying of the Jews*, containing two or three firkins apiece."

This explains what we have just been saying and what we shall have to say in our next chapter about the washings or purifications that the Jews observed in the days of Jesus.

This statement also gives us some insight into the question of just how much water was used, and as to how it was applied to the person to be washed or purified. According to most Bible scholars these pots or jars held from twenty to thirty gallons of water each.

Now you can readily see that no grown person could be immersed in one of these jars. In fact if you should put all of this water together it would hardly be sufficient to immerse a grown person, and certainly it would not be sufficient to immerse couches and tables, and yet Mark says that the Jews did *baptize* such things as this each time they came from the market place.

As we think of this statement of John's we can't help but be impressed with the thought that the Bible when properly studied explains itself.

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

A STUDY OF ARGUMENTS PRESENTED BY IMMERSIONISTS

As has already been stated in the introduction of this booklet, if our good immersionist friends would take the position that we take, there would be no ground for argument on this subject. However, they cannot see fit to take this position. They contend that nothing but immersion will do for baptism. They teach and contend that if you have not been baptized by immersion, then you have not been baptized at all. They contend that the word *baptize* means immersion and nothing else, and that nothing else will do. Since they do take this position, then it becomes necessary, in dealing with this subject, to consider their main points of argument. The subject could not be dealt with properly in any other way. In this part of the study we shall try to take up some of their strongest arguments and answer them. In doing this we want to be fair and Christian in our attitude.

THE NEW TESTAMENT MEANING OF THE GREEK WORD "BAPTIZO"*

The first main argument that our good friends, who contend for baptism by immersion only, offer is the meaning of the Greek word *baptize*. They

* (In our discussion of this word baptizo, we will use it in this form whenever we refer to its use. Of course we are all aware of the fact that it has various endings which are determined by the tense and its relationship to other words in the sentence where it occurs. Just as the English word occurs in different forms such as baptize, baptized, and baptism; or as the word wash has various forms such as wash, washed, or washing. For convenience we will use the simple form baptize wherever it occurs in any form in the New Testament. We do this to avoid confusion.)

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

contend that this word means immerse, dip, plunge, or submerge, and that it does not mean anything else and cannot mean anything else. They contend that nothing but immersion will fulfill the demands of this word. Now I want to say that this, to my mind, is their strongest point, and if it can be proved by the Bible then the whole argument is ended and there is nothing more to say on the subject. If they are right in their contention about the meaning of this word, then their point is won and we don't have a leg to stand upon. However, if it can be proved conclusively that this word does not always mean immerse as it is used in the New Testament, then their whole argument falls to the ground and they are left without a leg to stand upon. If it can be proved by the Bible that the word baptizo means to pour or sprinkle, then we have proved our point and they must admit that we are taking the right position when we practice either mode of baptism.

In our dealing with the meaning of this word, *baptizo*, we want it clearly understood that we very freely and frankly admit that the classical meaning of this word is usually immerse, dip, plunge or submerge. There are a few rare exceptions to this rule, but generally when this word is used by the writers of classical Greek it does mean just what our good immersionist friends contend it means. If we were dealing with the classical Greek of that day then there would be no argument on the question. They could easily prove their point by many references to the classical literature of that day. Any good lexicon of that day, or this, would bear out the truth of, this statement.

However, I must remind you that the New Testament is not written in what is known as classical Greek. Anyone who knows anything at all about the New Testament Greek, knows that this is true. The New Testament is not written in classical Greek, but it is rather written in what is known as the Koine, or

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

in other words the language of the common people. This is a fact that is clearly recognized by all Greek scholars. There was a time when many of the early scholars held to the idea that the language of the New Testament was a peculiar language, adopted by the Holy Spirit especially for the purpose of giving the truth to the people through the inspired writers. However, the recent work of the archaeologist has proved conclusively that this was not the case, but that rather the language used in the New Testament is the language the common people used in the days of Christ. In many instances it is different from the language of the classical writers, but it was the language the common people understood. This is a truth that is well established today.

So we see that in this study we are not dealing with the classical use of the word baptize. We are not so much concerned about how Socrates, Plato and Xenophon used the word, but we are very much concerned about how Jesus, John, Mark, and the people of that day used it. We are not so much concerned about how it is defined in some Greek Lexicon as we are about what it meant to Jesus and the people that he taught in the days of his flesh. Resort to Greek lexicons can never fully settle the question as to what this word means in the New Testament. The best way to find out what it meant to the people in the days of Christ is to go back to the New Testament and see how it is used there. In our discussion of this word we shall confine ourselves largely to the use of the word in the New Testament. That is to be the final test of the meaning of this word.

I feel sure that all of us are aware that the language of the common people is often different from that of the scholars. We are also aware of the fact that words are continually changing their meaning. Words that were in use two hundred years ago by the scholars are hardly understood by many of the

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

common people of this day. Words that were in use in the days when the King James version of the Bible was first translated, have become obsolete today. We hardly understand what some of them meant to the people of that day. Many illustrations of this could be given from our Bible if we had the time and space. Our language is changing all the time. Some words are dropped out of our everyday speech and new words are being coined to take their place. In the last World War there were many new words added to our vocabulary that we had never heard before, but today we use them without a second thought as to their origin and as to how we happened to get them. The language of different sections of our own land is entirely different from that of other parts of our land. If you don't believe this is true, then some time just listen to some typical New Yorker and some one from the deep South. They seem to speak a different language altogether.

I have a very dear friend who is a native of England and he speaks the English language in its purest form, however, he and his family have now lived for a number of years in Chicago. He told me some time ago that his daughter used the expression, "O Yea!" in his presence. He turned to her and asked her not to use that expression again. She asked him why. He told her that it was not good English. She retorted, "Daddy, I am not talking English, I am talking American." I mention this to point out to you the fact that even though we Americans are supposed to use the English language, yet our use of it is different from that of the people of England.

What is true of our language today was true of the language in use at the time of Christ. Many Greek words that had been used by the scholars in classical Greek had changed their meaning in the time of Christ and are used with an entirely different meaning in the *Koine*. Anyone who has studied the Greek New Testament will testify to that fact. There are many words

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

used in the New Testament that are not used with their classical meaning at all. The word *Logos* in classical Greek meant "word or speech." That meant anybody's word or speech. However, when we come to the New Testament, we find that John took this word and put a capital at the beginning and used it to mean Christ our Lord. "In the beginning was the *Logo*, and the *Logos* was with God, and the *Logos* was God." Now if you should go to a Greek Lexicon to look up the word *Logos* you would find the definition "word or speech," but if you should turn to the gospel by St. John you would find that it meant Christ Jesus our Lord. There is quite a difference in these two meanings, but this is the way it is often used in the New Testament. The word *Pneuma* in the classical Greek meant wind or breath. That meant any kind of wind or any kind of breath. However, when we come to the New Testament we find that this word is adopted and made to mean spirit, and when it is capitalized and the word Holy is put before it, it means the third person of the Trinity. So we see that this word is not used in its classical sense by the writers of the New Testament. It has a different and peculiar meaning when it is used in the New Testament. If you should turn to a Greek Lexicon for a definition of this word you would find one thing, but when you turn to the New Testament you find something entirely different.

There is another word that is not often used in the New Testament, but was in common use in the days of Christ, that had gone through somewhat the same change in its meaning. The word of which I speak is *bapto*. It comes from the same root as the word *baptizo*. Now in classical Greek this word meant to dye by the process of dipping or submerging the article in the dye. However, in common use this word had become so closely associated with the process of dyeing that it finally came to mean dye, regardless of now it might be done. It might be done either by dipping the

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

garment in the dye, or it might be done by sprinkling or pouring the dye upon the garment. Regardless of how it might be done the word *bapto* was used to describe it. One of the classical writers of that day used *this word bapto in* speaking of a lake being dyed (or *bapto*) with the blood of a rat. Now of course we can readily see that the lake was not immersed in the blood of the rat, but it was rather tinged or dyed with the blood of a rat. We also find an instance in the classical writers where Socrates speaks of an island being *baptized (baptizo) with* the spray of the ocean. I am sure we can readily see that he did not mean to imply that the island was immersed in the spray of the ocean, and yet he used this word *baptizo* in speaking of what took place.

Now I feel these three illustrations are sufficient to show that words are used in different ways and that words do change their meaning. Anyone who is familiar with the Greek New Testament could easily run through the New Testament and pick out a score of words that would illustrate and prove the very things I have been pointing out. There are many words in the Greek New Testament that are not used in their classical sense, but rather they have a different meaning from that of classical Greek.*

We have given these illustrations and have said these things in order that we might say this; it is our contention that the word *baptizo is not* used in its classical sense in the New Testament. A long time before

*(In "ESSENTIALS OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK" by Huddlestone, we find this statement, page 21, "The vocabulary of the New Testament furnishes nearly 900 words that are not found in the classical writers." In "A MANUAL GRAMMAR OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT" by Dana and Mantey, we find this statement, page 18, "Robertson (Dr. A. T. Robertson the great Baptist scholar) cites 186 words formerly supposed to be peculiar to Biblical Greek which the papyri and inscriptions have shown were in common use." (R. 65 f).

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

Jesus ever came into the world, this word *had* undergone a change in meaning and had come to have a very definite religious significance. The Jews *had* once spoken the Hebrew language and expressed their ideas through this medium. However, a long time before Christ came, the common people of the world had adopted the Greek language as the medium for expressing their thoughts. When the Jews changed over from the use of Hebrew and came to use the Greek language, they did not find a Greek word that exactly conveyed the idea of ceremonial cleansing or purification. They were in need of a word to convey this idea, for it held a very important place in their religious life. In their search for such a word they adopted the Greek word *baptizo*, and used it to convey the idea of ceremonial cleansing or purification regardless of how it might be done. In the days of Christ they did not use the word in its classical sense, but they used it to express the idea of cleansing or purification. When a Jew was *baptized* he was *cleansed*. This was the major meaning of the word to him. He was not so much interested in how it was done as what was done. He might be baptized either by sprinkling, pouring or immersion, but the thing that counted most with him was the fact that he had been cleansed. This was the idea the word conveyed to his mind. This was the way he thought about it. A careful study of the way the word is used in the New Testament will verify the thing we have been saying. The translators of the New Testament recognized this fact and, in many instances in the King James version, they use the English word wash where the Greek gives it *baptizo*. We have already called attention to three instances in the New Testament where this is the case. In Hebrews 9:10 the Greek gives the word *baptizo*, but in English it is translated divers washings. In Mark 7:4 the Greek word *baptizo* is used but in our version it is translated

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

washing. In Luke 11:39 the Greek used the word *baptizo* but in English it is translated *washed*.

In fact, anywhere you find the word baptize in the New Testament you can take that word out and insert either the word cleanse or purify and it does not change the meaning of the sentence in the least. As an illustration let us take the statement of Christ in Acts 1:5, "John indeed baptized (purified or cleansed) with water; but ye shall be baptized (purified or cleansed) with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Now while you can do that, and it does not change the meaning, yet you could not insert the word immerse and not change the meaning of many sentences. For the question would naturally arise, immerse in what? There is no water in the word immerse. You might immerse a person in many different things. Neither is there any water in the word sprinkle, for the same question would arise. Sprinkle with what? However, there was water implied in the use of the word baptize as the Jews understood it, for it had come to convey the idea of ceremonial cleansing with water. When a Jew had water sprinkled on him, with a bunch of hyssop, he was baptized. He had been purified or cleansed. This was the meaning of the word as it was used in the days of Jesus. This word had come to have this definite meaning a long time before Christ ever came. It had been used to convey this idea to the minds of the people. This is illustrated in the case we have mentioned from the book of Judith. She washed herself at the horse trough by sprinkling, but the historian calls it baptism. Josephus tells us of people that were baptized and he says it was done by sprinkling, and yet he uses the Greek word *baptizo* in speaking of it. These two illustrations show us how the word was used by reliable Jewish writers at that time. It is not used in its classical sense but has a different meaning. It conveyed a definite idea to the minds of the people in the days of

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

Christ. When they heard and used the word they were thinking of cleansing or purification, regardless of how it might be done. Now this is the meaning we are most concerned about. We are not so much interested in how Socrates used it and what it meant to him, but we are very much concerned about how Jesus used it and what it meant to the people that heard him speak.

The translators of our New Testament have very wisely carried over the word *baptizo* into our English translations for there is no other word that would exactly convey the meaning this word carried. It would not do to use either the words sprinkle, pour or immerse, for then the question would naturally arise as to what substance was to be used in either process. It is true that some over-zealous immersionist did get out a Bible some years ago and inserted the word *immerse* where the Greek word *baptizo* was used. However, it was not very long until this version was withdrawn because it proved too much and led to some very awkward situations. It would sound funny indeed to talk about divers (or many) immersions. Hebrews 9:10. The passage in Mark 7:4 would read very funny indeed if you should use the word immerse where the word *baptizo* occurs in the Greek. Neither can we reconcile ourselves to the idea that the Pharisee, spoken of in Luke 11:38, really expected Jesus to *immerse* himself before dinner. It would have been inconvenient to say the least. He did not expect him to immerse himself before dinner, but he was rather surprised that he did not wash or purify himself before the meal. The Pharisees purified themselves many times each day, but they did it by sprinkling. They also baptized or purified many household articles often, but they did it by sprinkling. We can hardly conceive of them immersing their beds, tables and couches before they ate. However, it was the custom for them to take clean water and a bunch of hyssop and sprinkle

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

many such articles. They called this *baptism according* to the gospel of Mark and Luke.

Now we are well aware of the fact that our good immersionist friends will not admit this point that we are making in this part of the discussion. In fact they could hardly afford to admit it, because if they did they would have to forsake their teaching and position. Since this is one of the points of difference in our study, it will be necessary for us to give further proof of the position we take. We feel that the proof already given is strong evidence in our favor. However, we are glad to announce that there is a great deal more evidence in the New Testament to prove this point. We shall now cite a number of instances in the New Testament where the use of the word *baptizo* clearly proves that ward does not always mean immerse. In fact these passages prove that in many cases it either means pour or *sprinkle*. I feel sure you do not have to be a Greek scholar to see that this is true. I now call your attention to a group of five passages from Matthew, Mark, Luke, John and the Acts where the word is used, and it cannot possibly mean immerse, but it definitely means pour. They are

Matthew 3:11, "I indeed baptize (*baptizo*) you with water unto repentance,... he shall baptize (*baptizo*) you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire." Here the word is used twice.

Mark 1:8, "I indeed have baptized (*baptizo*) you with water; but he shall baptize (*baptizo*) you with the Holy Ghost." Here it is used twice again.

Luke 3:16, "John answered, saying unto them all, I indeed baptize (*baptizo*) you with water: . . . he shall baptize (*baptize*) you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." In this passage we have it used twice again.

John 1:33, "And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize (*baptizo*) with water...the same is he which baptizeth (*baptizo*) with the Holy Ghost." It is used twice in this verse.

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

Acts 1:5, "For John truly baptized (*baptizo*) with water; but ye shall be baptized (*baptizo*) with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." The same is true here.

Now in each of these five passages we find the Greek word (*baptizo*) used twice. In each passage it is used once in speaking of the baptism of John, and the other time it is used in speaking of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. In the case of the baptism of John there would no doubt be a difference of opinion as to just how it was done. You might contend that it was done by immersion, and I might contend that it was done by sprinkling, and we might never be able to agree as to the mode of John's baptism. However, there can be no question as to how the people were baptized with the Holy Ghost on the Day of Pentecost for the Bible settles that question once and forever. If you will turn to the second chapter of Acts you will find that the Word of God says it was poured out upon them. In fact, it could not have been done in any other way if it was the fulfillment of the prophecy of Joel, for he plainly said it would be *poured out upon them*. If it had been done in any other way it would not have been the fulfillment of this prophecy. Peter said it was the fulfillment of this prophecy. It must have been done the way God said it would be done.

Now here we have five different passages from the New Testament, and in them Jesus, John the Baptist, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John all use the Greek word *baptizo* in speaking of something that was done by *pouring* and not by immersion. So we see that the word does not always mean immerse as it is used in the New Testament. Here are five instances in which it means pour and yet they call it baptism.

Sometime ago I was discussing this question with a good Baptist minister. He informed me that he had majored in Greek at College, and he admitted to me that he was considered an authority on the use of

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

Greek. I pointed out these five passages where the word baptizo is used, and then I told him that in these five instances that it could not mean immerse. I told him that it was done by pouring and gave him the proof for my contention. For a minute he looked very much perplexed and then his face lighted up and he said, "But they were immersed with the Holy Ghost on the Day of Pentecost. It says the room was filled where they were sitting." I laughed and said, "Now come, Doctor, surely you are not serious when you make that statement." He assured me that he was. I asked him to read the second verse of Acts 2. It says, "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it (the sound) filled all the house where they were sitting. I asked him if he was going to contend that the people were immersed in sound. That is what filled the house where they were sitting. The Holy Ghost is not mentioned here until the fourth verse and it says, "*they* were all *filled* with the Holy Ghost." Certainly there can be no immersion here for the Holy Ghost was on the *inside of them*. He was *in them* instead of them being immersed in the Holy Ghost. This is just what Jesus said would take place. John 14:17, "He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." There can be no immersion here unless you are going to contend that the Holy Ghost was immersed in the people, and, of course, that would not fit the case. They were to be baptized with the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost was poured out upon them and they were baptized (cleansed or purified) with the Holy Ghost. Peter clearly brings this out in his account of Cornelius and his household getting the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Acts 1.5:8, 9, "And God which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, *purifying* their hearts by faith." That was the purpose of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. It was to cleanse or purify. Water bap-

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

tism is outward cleansing. The Jews so understood it.*

In Acts 11:16, 16 we have the word *baptizo* used again in speaking of Cornelius and his household receiving the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. The context clearly shows that it was done by pouring, and yet Peter used the word *baptizo* in speaking of it. Here is what Peter says, "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost *fell* on them, *as on us at the beginning*. Then

*(In passing, may I say that if people will keep this idea in mind it will save them from much confusion on the matter of the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. Many times, when I preach on the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, I have people ask me, "Don't all Christian people have the Holy Ghost?" Certainly they do. They could not be Christians if they did not have the Holy Ghost. The only way to become a Christian is to be born of the Holy Ghost into the Kingdom. However, a person may have the Holy Ghost and still not have the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. The disciples had the Holy Ghost before the Day of Pentecost. Jesus plainly said so. He said, "He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." Before Pentecost they had the Holy Ghost with them, but at Pentecost they were baptized (cleansed or purified) by the Holy Ghost. It was the same Spirit they had known before, but he was doing something for them that he had not done before. The same thing is true today. In regeneration the Holy Ghost comes to us and imparts a new nature to us. It is a nature we never had before. In the baptism of the Holy Ghost it is the same Spirit, but he is doing something for us that was not done in regeneration. He cleanses or purifies our hearts. In other words, he takes away an old nature that we have always had and could not get rid of in any other way. It is the same Spirit, but he is doing a different work for us. We need both of these things done for us. We need the birth of or by the Holy Spirit and we also need the baptism (cleansing or purifying) with or by the Holy Ghost.)

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized (*baptizo*) with the Holy Ghost." In this passage Peter tells of how the Holy Ghost *fell on* them, and he immediately ties it up with Christ's promise of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. So we see they were baptized with the Holy Ghost, but it was done by pouring. Peter says it was done that way. In Acts 10:44 we are told that the Holy Ghost *fell on* all them. Peter also confirms what we have said before about the way it came as *on us at the beginning*. This is not what I have to say about it, but this is what the Word says about it. So we see here another instance where the word does not mean immerse; it means *to pour*, and yet Peter calls it baptism (*baptizo*).

In I Corinthians 10:2 we have the word *baptize* used by St. Paul and it cannot possibly mean immerse in this case. In this passage Paul is speaking of what happened to the Children of Israel when they crossed the Red Sea and he says, "And they were all baptized (*baptizo*) unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." In this case it could not have been done by immersion for the Bible plainly says that the waters were a wall unto them on the right hand and on their left. We are also told they went over on dry ground. In the 14th chapter of Exodus we are told three different times that they went over on dry ground. It is simply out of the question to think of a person being immersed in water and being on dry ground at the same time. It just cannot be done. *A person has to get his feet wet to be immersed*. They were baptized, but it was done by sprinkling, for Paul gays they were under the cloud in the sea. The baptism came from the cloud and not in the sea. Yet Paul uses the word *baptizo* in speaking of this. Here we have another case where the word does not always mean immerse or dip.

We have already referred several times to the passage. Hebrews 9:10, Mark 7:4, and Luke 11:38.

WHY BAPTIZES BY SPRINKLING

However, we ask you to consider them with us again for the *word baptizo* is used in each of these three passages, and they are part of our proof in our effort to prove that the word *baptizo* does not always mean immerse or dip.

Hebrews 9:10, "Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers *washings (baptizo)* and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation." Here the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews is speaking of the Old Testament dispensation and he says that they had *divers washings* or baptisms. The word *divers* means many. They had many baptisms. Now if you will search diligently through the Old Testament you will find many cases of where the people were sprinkled and were commanded to do so; but I don't believe you can find any place where they were commanded to immerse. In fact, if you had suggested to an orthodox Jew the idea of being immersed in a pool of still water that some other person had already been immersed in, he would have felt insulted. He would not consider that cleansing. He would feel that he had been polluted or defiled. For a true Jew it had to be clean water and he also wanted living (moving) water. That was why they used a bunch of hyssop and sprinkled it upon the person to be washed. You can find an abundance of evidence for *many sprinklings* in the Old Testament but *not any immersions*. In the days of Jesus they had many sprinklings but not immersions. It is these many sprinklings the writer is speaking of in this passage, but he calls them *baptisms*. He mentions one of them in Hebrews 9:19, "For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and *sprinkled* both the book, and all the people." This is *one* of the *many baptisms* that he speaks of, but it was done by sprinkling. He calls it baptism, and he knew how the word should be used and what it meant

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

I think you can see that this is one more place where the word does not always mean immerse.

Mark 7:4, "And when they come from the market, except they wash, they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the *washing (baptizo)* of cups, and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables." In this passage Mark tells us that it was the custom in the days of Christ for the Jews to *baptize* their cups, pots, brazen vessels, and even their tables. They did this many time's a day. He says they did it every time they came from the :market. Now I feel sure that any clear thinking person can readily see that the people did not immerse all of these things many times a day. That would be ridiculous to say the least. It was their custom, in those days, to keep a vessel of clean water handy and with a bunch of hyssop they would go around through the house and sprinkle a bit of this water as an act of cleansing. It was a part of their religion to do this. It was ceremonial cleansing. However, Mark uses the word *baptizo* to speak of it. No doubt he knew what the word meant in that day, and in this case it could not mean immerse.

Luke 11:38, "And when the Pharisee saw it, he marveled that he had not first *washed (baptizo)* before dinner." In this passage Luke is telling us of a visit that our Lord made to the home of a Pharisee. He tells us that the Pharisee marveled that he *did not baptize before dinner*. I feel sure any thinking person can readily see that the Pharisee did not expect Jesus to immerse himself before he sat down for the meal. Common sense would lead us to see that this is not what Luke is speaking of in this passage. He is speaking of the washing that was so strictly observed by all the Pharisees of that day. However, it was not done by immersion, and yet Luke uses this word to speak of it. Surely Doctor Luke knew how to use the word in the right way. He did know how to use it, and

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

in this case it does not mean immerse.

Thus far we have quoted from Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Acts, I Corinthians and Hebrews. We have showed how John the Baptist, Jesus, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul and the writer of Hebrews used this word. In *six* cases it means to *pour*, and in *four* others it means to *sprinkle*. And yet in all of these places the word *baptizo* is used. Surely these men knew how the word should be used, and what it meant in that day. It may have meant immerse, dip, plunge or submerge to the classical writers of that day, but it certainly does not mean that in the New Testament. It seems to me that this is clearly proved by these many passages that we have called to your attention. We leave it to you to decide on the scriptural evidence we have given. We have not appealed to some Doctor of Divinity for our proof. Neither have we gone to the Greek Lexicons to see what they have to say on the subject. We have let the New Testament speak for itself. To us this is the most conclusive proof in the world. We are convinced that the word does not always mean immerse. Many times it means pour, and in other instances it means to sprinkle.

"BURIED WITH CHRIST IN BAPTISM"

The second point, that our good immersionist friends place a great deal of stress on in their contention for baptism by immersion only, is that of being buried with Christ in baptism. Of course they go to Romans 6:3, 4, and also to Colossians 2:11, 12 for their teaching on this point. Since this is true let us look carefully at these two passages and see just what they do say. I give them here in full so that we may have them before us for our study.

Romans 6:3, 4, "Know ye not, that so many of us

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

were baptized *into Jesus Christ* were baptized *into his death*? Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism *into his death*: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. Colossians 2:11, 12, "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made *without hands*, in the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: Buried with him in baptism, wherein ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead."

Now most people, when they read these two passages where it speaks of being baptized and buried, immediately jump to the conclusion that Paul is speaking of water baptism and say, "There that proves it. We must go down under the water." However, before you jump to such conclusions, let us take the time to see what Paul really does say. I want to especially call your attention to that little preposition "*into*." It is used three times in Romans 6:3, 4 and is the key to this passage. Now Paul says that the baptism of which he speaks causes us to be baptized *into Christ* and *into his death*. May I ask you the question, "Does water baptism do this for a person?" The answer is "Not necessarily." It is possible for a person to be baptized a dozen times with water and still not be *in Christ*. There are many people today who have been baptized with water, but they are not in *Jesus Christ*. They are in sin and of the world. The baptism of which Paul speaks puts you *into Christ and into his death*. This is not figurative language that Paul is using. He is talking about something that really takes place and it puts you *into Christ* and *into his death*. It also brings you into touch with the power of his resurrection. Does water baptism do that? *Is there a baptism that really does do what Paul speaks of here?* There is and Paul tells about it in I Corinthians 12:13, "For by one Spirit are we all *baptized into one body*." It is

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

this baptism that Paul is speaking of in both of these messages. In fact, in the passage in Colossians he plainly tells us that he is speaking of a circumcision *without hand*, but he is speaking of a spiritual circumcision that puts off the body of the sins of the flesh, and then he links baptism right up with this circumcision. He is, of course, speaking of a spiritual baptism. In fact, there is not a drop of water in either of these passages. Dr. A. J. Gordon, the great Baptist Divine of Boston, says so. Certainly water baptism cannot put us into his death. Neither can water baptism free us from the sins of the flesh, but the baptism of which Paul speaks does do this very thing for it is spiritual baptism.

It is so easy for us to be swayed by our prejudices and preconceived ideas. We are so easily influenced by our surroundings that it is hard for us to shake off their influence. When you speak to people in this part of the world about being buried, the first thought that comes to their mind is that of being placed in the ground and covered over with dirt. This is the picture the word calls to their minds. However, that is not the way Jesus was buried. He was carried into a tomb with the opening above ground and laid on a shelf in that tomb. A stone was then rolled before the opening. I have read of certain tribes of people who bury their dead by building pyres above the ground and placing their dead up in the air on those pyres. If you should talk to them about being buried in baptism, it would suggest an entirely different picture to them from the picture most of us have in our minds.

A good Baptist minister said to me sometime ago, "Doesn't the Bible say that baptism is a symbol of the death and resurrection of Christ? When we are baptized doesn't that symbolize the death and burial of Christ?" I said, "No! The Bible does not say any such thing." To my mind there is no scriptural grounds for such a conception. Water baptism might

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

just as easily be a symbol of the sprinkling of Christ's blood upon our hearts, or it might easily be a symbol of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. In fact there is far more scripture for this latter view than for the one suggested by the minister. Jesus never one time intimated that baptism was to be a symbol of his death and burial. He did say that when we partake of the elements of the Lord's Supper that we do show forth his death until he comes again. However, the Bible does not say that baptism is a symbol of his death and burial. In these two passages Paul is dealing with more vital truths than the mode of baptism. To wrest these two passages out of their setting and use them to try and prove baptism by immersion only, is to do violence to the spirit of Paul's message. If he were alive today I am sure he would protest against such a use and would tell us that we are missing what he is trying to say. In both of these passages he is dealing with great sublime spiritual truths. It is unfair to drag these passages down to a lower level.

In the days of St. Paul for a person to accept Christian baptism regardless of what mode was used in doing it, it meant in a very real sense a death. In the days of Paul, Christian baptism was the dividing line between the old life and a new life begun. It was the visible symbol to the world that you were cutting loose from father, mother, home, friends, and the old life. When Paul accepted Christian baptism he really died to his old life and started out to live in a new world. Water baptism was the step that declared this to the world. This same thing is true of Jews today and also in many heathen lands. For a Jew or a person in a heathen land to accept Christian baptism today, regardless of the mode, it means death in a very real sense of the word.

When I was but a lad there was something that happened in my home city that illustrated this in a very striking way. There was a fine Jewish family in

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

our city. They had several sons, but one of them fell in love with a Gentile girl. This was not so bad in the eyes of his parents, for many Jewish boys marry Gentile girls these days. However, when this boy and girl were married he was also baptized into the fellowship of a Christian church. It happened that he joined the First Presbyterian Church and was baptized by sprinkling, but the mode of his baptism did not make any difference with his parents. To them their boy was lost. He had died. They really had a funeral just as if he had actually died. They mourned him as one dead. To them he is dead. They never mention his name in their home. His brother meets him on the street and never speaks. He is dead so far as they are concerned.

Fortunately most of us do not have to pay such an extreme price when we are baptized. However, we do need to see that to accept baptism, regardless of how it may be done, is a very serious matter, and it should mean more than just going through an empty ceremony and then be forgotten. It ought to mean that we have renounced the world with all of its vain pomp and glory, and that we will no longer follow or be led by the dictates of our former manner of life. We have died to all of this and have started out to live a new life in Christ. I fear there are too many people who feel about baptism somewhat like an old fellow expressed himself about getting married. He said he believed he would just get married and be done with it. There are too many people that seem to feel the same way about baptism. They are baptized and then they are done with it. It does not seem to mean anything to them. They can talk very glibly about being buried and risen again, and about following Christ in baptism, but seemingly they do not feel under any obligation to follow him in life. We need to see that it is far more important to follow Christ in life and our daily conduct than to just observe some certain ritual or form and then forget it. Regardless of the mode that is used in

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

our baptism it ought to be a very serious matter with us, and we ought to show to the world by our life that we consider it so.

GOING DOWN INTO, AND COMING STRAIGHTWAY UP
OUT OF

The third point that our good immersionist friends emphasize in their teaching on this subject are the statements in the gospels where it says, "Jesus went *down into* the water, and came *straightway up out of* the water." They like to put a great deal of stress on these two expressions and they use them as though they thought this ought to settle the argument once and for all.

However, to my mind, they are not the least bit convincing when it comes to settling the matter of how Christ was baptized. It would be a very easy thing for anyone to walk down into the river Jordan and stand there and be baptized and then come up out of the water without ever being immersed in the water. The Bible says that Jesus went *into* Peter's boat, but that does not mean he was immersed in the boat. The truth of the matter is he just sat dawn in it and used it for a pulpit. He went into it but only a small part of his body was really in the boat, most of it was above the boat. The Bible also says that he went up *into* the mount and sat dawn and taught his disciples. The fact that he went up *into* the mount does not mean to suggest that he was immersed or submerged in the mountain.

When I went on my first circuit I had one church that was about eight miles from my home. There was one stream that I had to ford seven times in going to preach at that church. I rode horseback on these trips. In the roundtrip I forded that stream fourteen times in all. Fourteen times I went down *into* that stream, and fourteen times I came *straightway up out of* it, but usually I reached home just as dry as when I left.

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

I have thought for many years that sometime I may be able to make a trip to the Holy Land. I have often thought that if I ever did I would like to be baptized near the same place our Lord was baptized and in the same way he was baptized. If I ever get to make such a trip and undertake to be baptized as I believe Jesus was, I intend to walk down into the river Jordan and stand there in the water and then have some proper person take a bunch of hyssop and dip it into the water and sprinkle it on me.

I believe when I have done that, then I will have been baptized as Jesus was by John the Baptist. Then I will come straightway up out of the water just as Jesus did after he had been sprinkled by John. I shall have more to say about why I believe this to be true later on.

FOLLOWING OUR LORD IN BAPTISM

The fourth point, in the immersionist contention for baptism by immersion only, is found in the phrase at the beginning of this chapter. They like to play upon this phrase and emphasize it. To them it seems to be very convincing and conclusive. However, to my way of thinking it is not a real argument, but is merely a catchy phrase. When it is closely examined it becomes rather weak and unconvincing. To follow Jesus literally in baptism would involve a great deal more than just being dipped in a pool of water. In the first place, if we are to literally follow Jesus in baptism, we would at least have to seek out a stream of moving water. As we have already said, to suggest to a truly orthodox Jew the idea of being dipped in a pool of still water where many other people had already been dipped, would be shocking indeed. He would consider himself polluted or defiled by such a procedure. The Jew wanted living or moving water when he was to be cleansed. In the second place, to literally follow Jesus in baptism would mean that every candidate would

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

have to wait until he was thirty years of age before he was baptized. There was a definite reason why Jesus was not baptized at an earlier age. It was at this age the priest was publicly inducted into his office by sprinkling. Jesus is our Great High Priest. He was baptized by the son of a priest. By right of birth John could have been a priest in the temple. This leads us to see that in the third place, if we are to literally follow Jesus in baptism, we must be baptized by a member of the priestly family.

To many people today this catchy phrase "following Jesus in baptism" seems to mean a great deal. However, I want to say that when you that when you are baptized by a Protestant minister today in a pool of still water and in the name of the Father Son and Holy Ghost, you are not really following Jesus in baptism. You have not literally followed him at all. Many people in the early days of the church, who had been baptized unto John's baptism, were baptized again in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. No, my friend, when you receive Christian baptism today, regardless as to the mode, you are not literally following Jesus in baptism. This is just a catch phrase that some people like to use to impress unthinking people. It may impress some people, but it does not carry any weight with me. I am not trying to follow Jesus in baptism. I am trying to follow him in my life and conduct, but there are some things that he did in fulfillment of the Mosaic Law that I do not feel called upon to do.

HOW WAS JESUS BAPTIZED?

Of course, we recognize the fact that the way Jesus was baptized is of great importance. If we can determine conclusively how Jesus was baptized, then we will have a great deal of light on this question as to the proper mode of baptism. I feel sure that all of us would be satisfied to follow the mode that was used in his

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

baptism. If he was baptized by immersion then we would want to be baptized the same way. If he was baptized by sprinkling or pouring, then we would want to have it done in that way. This naturally brings us to the question, "How was Jesus baptized?"

Of course, our good immersionist friends would answer, "By Immersion." But what grounds do they have for this contention? It seems to me that their contention for this rests upon two inferences. In the first place, they infer that the word *baptizo* means immerse and cannot mean anything else. Jesus was baptized. Therefore, he had to be immersed for the word cannot mean anything else.

Now if they were right in their contention about the meaning of the word *baptizo*, then of course they would be right in their deductions about the mode of Jesus baptism. However, I think we have already proved that they are wrong in their contention about the meaning of the word as it is used in the New Testament. We have proved by the New Testament and other evidence that the word does not always mean immerse. We have proved that there are a number of instances where it means pour, and in other instances it means sprinkle. Since this is true, then we must turn to other sources for added evidence as to how Jesus was baptized. When you start with a false premise in your argument, then you are bound to arrive at a false conclusion. The more logical you are in your reasoning the more certain you are to arrive at a false conclusion. The first premise must be right if we are to arrive at a right conclusion. That is just what our good immersionist friends have done. They have jumped to the conclusion that just because the *word baptizo* usually means immerse, in the classical Greek, it must also mean the same thing in the New Testament. However, this is a false conclusion, as we have already proved by an abundance of evidence from the New Testament as well as other sources. We will

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

have to seek from some source other than classical Greek to find the real meaning of this word. The only place where this proof can be found is in the Bible. We must let the Word of God speak for itself. This must be our final authority. It does speak with clarity and conviction on this, as well as on all other subjects. Our good immersionist friends, having already jumped to the conclusion that the word *baptizo* always means immerse, find it very easy to conclude that since Jesus went down into the water, and came straightway up out of the water, therefore, he was immersed in the waters of Jordan. But we see that the whole argument rests purely on conclusions and we have clearly proved that one of them is a false conclusion. The other might also prove to be false.

We have already suggested that the mere fact that Jesus went down into the water, and came straightway up out of the water, does not necessitate his being immersed in the water. He could easily have walked down into the water and stood there for baptism and then come straightway up out of the water and never have been immersed in the water. When Jesus crossed the brook Kedron on his way to the garden, no doubt he went down into the water and came straightway up on the other side, but none of us would contend that he was immersed in the brook Kedron. And yet it would be just as reasonable to contend for that as it is to contend that he had to be immersed in Jordan just because these two expressions are used. It is just another illustration of the fact that one false conclusion may lead to another.

The whole argument for immersion rests upon inference. They infer that *baptizo* means immerse. Therefore, they infer that going down into means going under the water. This then leads to the inference that when Paul speaks of being baptized into Jesus, and being buried with him by baptism into his death, then this must mean immersion. One argument rests

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

upon another and when you pull out the foundation the whole thing falls to the ground. We have proved that their first conclusion is a false one. It just can't stand the test of a clear analysis in the light of the New Testament. You may appeal to the classical scholars and Greek lexicons, but when the New Testament speaks it says otherwise. It is the New Testament that we are interested in.

If we were shut up to the New Testament use of the word baptizo to determine the mode that was used in the baptism of Jesus, then we could never be positive in our conclusions as to how Jesus was baptized. According to the New Testament it might mean pour, sprinkle or immerse. I think we have proved conclusively that it does not always mean immerse. We have proved that Jesus could have been baptized either by sprinkling or pouring, and it would have fulfilled the meaning of the word according to New Testament usage.

I rejoice that we are not shut up to inferences alone for light on the question of how Jesus was baptized. There is another great field of Bible evidence that sheds light on this question. To me this field of evidence offers some strong proof on the other side of the question. I confess that I have often wondered why it has not been used more in the consideration of this subject. It seems to me that it is the only proper source to begin a study of the question of how Jesus was baptized, and the evidence to my mind is very convincing and conclusive. I ask you to give it your prayerful and careful consideration.

However, before launching into the discussion of this evidence, we would like to digress for a few minutes to testify and also tell you how we happened to stumble on this field of evidence. It is true that we just stumbled upon it. No one ever pointed it out to us. So far as we are concerned it is entirely original. We never had it suggested to us by any other person.

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

In fact, when we came to consider this question, we did not have any evidence on the affusion side of the subject.

I was converted and grew up in a Methodist Church. My mother was a very devout Christian and a zealous Methodist. However, she did not have narrow views on this or any other subject, She never taught me along this line. I was baptized by sprinkling, but my mother did not tell me why it was done that way. Neither did our pastors preach on this subject and instruct us along these lines. This question was never dealt with by our pastors. They left us in the dark on the subject. The only argument I ever heard on the subject during my childhood came from the immersionist point of view. My parents were very broad and charitable in their views and taught us to believe that there were good Christian people in all the different churches. I am glad I had that kind of teaching in childhood. I have found that my parents were right at this point. I have traveled extensively in my work as a minister, and have found good Christian people in all branches of the Christian church, and I love them and appreciate them. We may differ on some points, but we love the same Lord and are going to the same heaven. My wife came from a devout Baptist home and all of her people belong to that branch of the church. I have never put forth one single effort to try and change their views on the matter of baptism. The truth of the matter is we have never even discussed it. My wife came to the Methodist Church with me and is a loyal helper in my work. We are in hearty accord on this subject and we love and appreciate the other members of her family that hold different views on this subject. I have one brother who is a member of the Campbellite Christian Church. He is a zealous contender for baptism by immersion, but I never mentioned the subject to him when he left our church and went with his wife to the Christian

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

Church. It is true he tackled me once on the subject, but he soon gave me up as a hopeless case and has never brought the subject up since.

In my boyhood I had one uncle who was an ardent Baptist and a. zealous contender for baptism by immersion. In fact he believed and argued that it was necessary to be immersed in order to reach heaven. He delighted to argue the subject. He would argue by the hour on this subject. When I was in my teens he would harangue me by the hour on the subject of baptism. It was not an argument for I had no argument to offer. He did all the talking and I think I received about all the argument that is to be presented from that side. I did not tell him, or anyone else for that matter, but he did get me terribly upset on the subject. I have always tried to be open and fair in my attitude on such questions and have always tried to be open to new light on any Bible subject. I believe this is the proper attitude for every Christian to have. I feel that we ought to be open to truth and willing to accept new light if it comes from the Bible. This was my attitude on this subject.

Finally I made up my mind that I would not accept what someone else believed on the subject, but I decided to do some investigating for myself. I decided that nothing but the Bible could settle this question for me. I secured an Analytical Concordance and began a diligent study of the subject. The first thing I did was to look for the word *immerse*. To my utter amazement I could not find it used anywhere in the Bible. I then looked up the word sprinkle and found it used many, many times. I looked up the word pour and found it used many times. Then I asked myself the question, "How was Jesus baptized?" At that time I did not know anything about the Greek language and was not the least bit biased in my conception of what the word meant in Greek. I was not familiar with the way the classical writers used the word and so was en-

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

tirely open to find out how it was used in the New Testament. If I know my mind and heart, I was not the least biased in my attitude at all. If I had any leaning at all at that time, it was toward the immersionist point of view. However, after a diligent study of the Bible, both Old and New Testament, I came to the conclusion that Jesus must have been baptized by sprinkling. I will now tell you why I came to that conclusion.

I believe Jesus was baptized according to the Mosaic Law. I believe he was baptized in fulfillment of the Mosaic Law. Let us remember that Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, was a priest. When he was inducted into the priest's office he had water sprinkled upon him. As a priest he was called upon many times to sprinkle water upon people. He sprinkled water on the leper that was cleansed. He sprinkled water on the person who was to be cleansed from a dead body. He sprinkled water upon a woman when she was to be purified after the birth of a child. No doubt Mary, the Mother of Jesus, had water sprinkled on her when she stood in the temple with Jesus in her arms. A strict Jew sprinkled his body and articles of furniture many times. As the writer of Hebrews says, they had divers, or many baptisms. According to the writer of Hebrews and also Mark and Luke, these washings by wrinkling were called baptism in the days of Jesus. We have no record of where John was ever baptized, but I venture to say that if he ever was baptized, it was *done by sprinkling*. In fact I cannot conceive of Zacharias doing it in any other way. That was the way the law said it should be done and naturally he would do it according to the law. If John had lived and so desired, he, by right of birth, could have been a priest. If he had become a priest, then it would have been his duty to sprinkle many people. There is absolutely no Old Testament scripture for baptism by immersion. It was unheard of in Old Testament ties

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

The only case in the Old Testament that I know anything about, where it says a person was cleansed by dipping, is that of Naaman the leper, and of course, no one would contend that his was a baptism because he dipped himself seven times before he was clean. I don't think the most rabid immersionist would go quite that far. I have heard of some who contend for three times, but I have never heard of any going in for seven times.

Here is what the law said about the induction of the priest into his office. Numbers 8:6, 7, "Take the Levites from among the children of Israel, and cleanse them. And thus shall you do unto them, to cleanse them: Sprinkle water of purifying upon them," etc.

Then in Numbers 19:18, 19, 20 we have the law for cleansing the unclean. "And a clean person shall take hyssop and dip it into the water and *sprinkle it upon* the tent, and upon all the vessels, and upon the persons that were there, and upon him that touched a bone, or of one slain, or of one dead, or of a grave: And the clean person shall *sprinkle* upon the unclean on the third day," etc.

In the book of Leviticus 14th chapter we have the law as to the cleansing of the leper. It would be of interest and no doubt great profit to you if you would turn to this chapter and read and study it. We quote one statement from this chapter. It is found in the seventh verse. Here it is: "And he (the priest) shall *sprinkle* upon him that is to be cleansed from leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean," etc.

In these three passages we have a glimpse at the process of cleansing as the law prescribed it. For the induction of the priest it was by *sprinkling*. For the cleansing of an unclean person it was to be done by *sprinkling*. When a leper was to be cleansed it was to be done by *sprinkling*. Moses *sprinkled* both the book and all the people with clean water. Here we have the law for sprinkling and a precedent already set by

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

the great Lawgiver himself. Now I must confess to you that I can't conceive of John going against all of this and starting an entirely *new mode* of baptism. Immersion was not the custom in that day. *If John baptized by immersion, then he started a new mode of baptism.* If he started a new mode then there is nothing in the Bible to indicate such a thing.

When Jesus came to John to be baptized and John protested that he was not worthy to perform the act, then Jesus said, "Suffer it to be so that we fulfill all righteousness." In other words let us do it in fulfillment of the law. In the eyes of the Jews that was the fulfillment of all righteousness. When you had kept all of the law you had fulfilled all righteousness. Jesus said, "I came not to destroy the law but to fulfill it." Now, if Jesus was baptized in fulfillment of the law, he certainly was not immersed. There is absolutely nothing in the law about immersion, but the law does command sprinkling. I believe that is the way John baptized Jesus. I believe he took a bunch of hyssop and sprinkled water upon Jesus as he stood in the river Jordan. It seems to me that it is perfectly logical to believe this. I can't conceive of it being done any other way, in view of what the law commanded.

As has already been suggested, the scribes and Pharisees were sticklers for things being done according to the letter of the law. There is nothing in the law that would even suggest baptism by immersion. There is plenty in the law that commands sprinkling. If John had baptized by any other mode than the law provided, then the scribes and Pharisees would have raised a howl to high heaven. However there is nothing in the record to even suggest that they offered a single objection to the mode of John's baptism. They accepted it and took it as a matter of course. The very fact that they were silent on this point is proof to me that it was done according to the law. To accept any other would mean that we would have to believe

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

that John instituted an entirely new mode of baptism that had no precedent in the Old Testament, and that was contrary to the customs that had prevailed among the Jews for hundreds of years before Christ. I just can't believe such a thing could have happened and no notice being taken of it by the Jews of that day.

There are two subjects that are of considerable importance in the Christian life. The subjects of which I speak are: that the proper amount of money to give and the proper mode of baptism. Strange to say Jesus had very little to say about how much of our material substances we were to give to God. He, of course, had a great deal to say about money and its proper use. However, he did not set forth any definite rule as to how much his followers were to give. I used to wonder about this. I would ask myself the question, "Why did Jesus not settle this question once and for all, so that there would be no ground for dispute or misunderstanding?" However, I have come to the conclusion that he did settle it. In the Old Testament God gave the law as to how much his people were to give to him and his work. He had said, "Bring ye all the *tithe* into the storehouse. The tithe is mine, and if you fail to bring it in then ye are thieves and robbers." When Jesus came he set his seal upon *this law* and said, "This *ye ought to have done.*" Matthew 23:23. What more could he say than this? What more need he say than this? God had spoken and Jesus set his seal upon it. That ought to be enough for anyone. *That law has never been revoked.*

The same thing is true with reference to the proper mode of baptism. I used to wonder why Jesus did not speak some positive word on this subject, that has vexed the minds of so many good people, and settle it once and forever as to the proper mode, so that there would be no ground for dispute at this point. I am now convinced that *Jesus did settle the matter.* In the

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

Old Testament God gave the law. He told us how it should be done. When Jesus came into the world *he accepted God's mode of baptism, and set his seal upon it* by submitting to it. What more needs to be said on the subject? What more can be said on the subject? Unless it be, "Go and do thou likewise."

The thing that has led to the confusion has not been due to the fact that we did not have a clear cut example of how it should be done, but it has been due to the fact that people have come to look at the pattern with their vision distorted by preconceived ideas about the meaning of the word *baptizo*. Many have gone to the classical writers for their definition of this word instead of going to the Bible. They have come to the Bible with preconceived ideas about what the word means, and have tried to twist the Bible and make it fit their preconceived ideas. It just won't work.

I firmly believe Jesus was baptized according to the way God's law said it should be done. To my mind the burden of proof rests upon our good immersionist friends to prove otherwise. To do this they will have to do more than give the definition of the word *baptizo* that is found in some Greek lexicon, or tell of how some classical writer used it in the time of Socrates. I am not so much concerned about how they used it. The thing I want to know is; How did John the Baptist, Jesus, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John and Paul use it? I am willing to let the Bible settle this question, and I believe when we let it speak it will speak clearly. It has already spoken and Jesus has given his testimony by accepting baptism the way God said it should be done. That is enough for me.

When John the Baptist appeared on the scene, and the people began to flock to him for baptism, this naturally attracted the attention of the scribes and Pharisees. They were the religious leaders and the custodians of the law. They came out to him and began to question him. They asked of him saying, "Art thou

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

the Messiah?" He told them he was not. They asked him if he was that prophet, and he told them that he was not. Then they asked him, "If thou art not the Messiah or that prophet then why do you baptize?" This was a perfectly reasonable question for them to ask, for there were two outstanding Old Testament prophecies that told of a time that would come when many people would be sprinkled. We have already quoted them earlier in this discussion. One of them is that statement found in Isaiah 52:15, "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations:" The other is that passage found in Ezekiel 36:26, "Then will I *sprinkle* clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean:" etc. The Jews fully expected these prophecies to be fulfilled.

However, I want you to notice that it was to be done by sprinkling. If it had been done in any other way, it would not have fit these two prophecies, and the Jews would have objected. However, they did not object to the mode that John was using. He must have been doing it as the prophets said it would be done.

No doubt John the Baptist baptized great multitudes of people. Matthew 3:16, "Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the regions round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." Of course, we would not contend that every single person in all of these sections mentioned went out to be baptized, but certainly we have reason to believe that great crowds of them went. Now to baptize all of these people by immersion would have been some task and would have consumed a great deal of time. However, it would have been a very simple matter for John to have stood in the edge of the river Jordan with a bunch of hyssop in his hand and sprinkled the people as they walked down into the water to him. He could have done that and hardly have missed a lick in his preaching. He had a clear cut example for such a procedure in the case of Moses sprinkling the Children of Israel in the wilderness. There

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

must have been somewhere between two and three million people at the time Moses sprinkled them, but it was not such a great task for him to walk through their midst with a vessel of water and a bunch of hyssop-on a reed and sprinkle them as he went. It seems to me that John would be more likely to follow this example than it would be for him to institute an entirely new and unheard of mode of baptism.

With this picture in our minds, I would like to call your attention to something that Jesus said to the people in speaking of John the Baptist and his ministry to the people. Matthew 11:7-9, "And as they departed, Jesus began to say unto the multitudes concerning John, What went ye out into the wilderness to see? *A reed shaken* with the wind? But what went ye out for to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? behold, they that wear soft clothing are in kings' houses. But what went ye out for to see? A prophet? Yes, I say unto you, and more than a prophet."

Now, with this scripture before us, I want to invite your attention to that statement where it speaks of a *reed shaken* in the wind. The Greek word that is translated *shaken* really means waving. It means a reed waving in the wind. Now I know that most people think Jesus is using this figure to call attention to the rugged steadfastness of John. They often quote it to show that John was not a person that could be shaken by every wind that came along. However, may I suggest that this may not be what Jesus was referring to in this place. He may have been referring to the reed that John used in his baptism. It is entirely possible that Jesus is saying to these people, "Did you go out to see John baptize the people, with the reed and a bunch of hyssop tied on the end of it, waving it over the people?" In other words, did you, like many people today, just go out to see the baptism? Or did you go out to hear the prophet of God and be influenced by what he said? If you did go to hear a prophet,

WHIP BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

then you certainly heard one, for John was a prophet and more than a prophet. It is entirely possible that this is what Jesus is saying in this place. A careful study of the whole passage would seem to indicate this.

Regardless of whether you can see fit to accept our interpretation of this passage or not, it does not affect the main body of our argument as to how Jesus was baptized. In fact we would not be dogmatic in our contention for this interpretation of this passage. We merely suggest it as a possible interpretation and feel that it might be a side light that might add to our understanding of how John baptized. Our main contention is that he did it by sprinkling because that was the way the law said it should be done. We believe he obeyed the law of Moses when he baptized Jesus. He had an example for sprinkling in the case of Moses baptizing the Children of Israel. It had been the custom for hundreds of years before Christ came for people to be sprinkled. There is no ease recorded in the Old Testament of where people were baptized by immersion. There is nothing in the law about immersion, but there is about sprinkling. The writer of the book of Judith calls sprinkling baptism. The historian Josephus calls sprinkling baptism. Mark, Luke and the writer of Hebrews all call sprinkling baptism. With this great mass of evidence we are forced to believe that Jesus was baptized in that way. To us this mass of evidence is conclusive. It satisfies our mind on the subject. We leave it to you to decide as to the validity of this evidence we have presented on the question as to how Jesus was baptized. We are satisfied in our own heart and mind that it was done by sprinkling. This is the only conclusion we could honestly reach in the light of the scriptural evidence we have before us. If we are mistaken in our conclusion on this point, then we are honest in our conviction. If we are mistaken, then it is a mistake of the head and not of the heart. We began our study of this subject with an open mind.

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

SOME NEW TESTAMENT CASES OF BAPTISM

In reaching our conclusions as to how Jesus and other people in New Testament times were baptized, we are shut up to the process of reasoning. We must consider all the evidence given in the Bible and also remember the circumstances that prevailed if we are to arrive at the right conclusion. There is no place in the New Testament where it clearly and positively states in so many words that people were baptized with water either by sprinkling, pouring or immersion. We must reach our conclusions as to how it was done by inference. As the logician would say, we must reach our conclusion by the process of deduction. This is called deductive reasoning. It is true that some extreme immersionists take the position that the word baptizo always means immerse, and therefore, when the Bible says a person was baptized this necessarily means that they were immersed in water. However, we have proved by the Bible that this contention is not true. The word does not always mean immerse. There are times when it means to pour, and other times when it means to sprinkle. Therefore, their contention breaks down. We will have to have more than the word to decide how it was done. There are other factors that enter into the consideration of how it was done. The matter of time, place and many other things enter into the evidence and help us to decide as to how it was done. With these facts before us, we now invite you to consider with us some New Testament cases of baptism.

The first case that we call to your attention is that of the three thousand people who were added to the Church on the Day of Pentecost. The first thing I would call to your attention about this case is the fact that, so far as the record informs us, there was no elaborate preparation made for the baptism of this great host of new converts, and no great amount of

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

time was consumed in their baptism. Acts 2:41, "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." This is a very brief record, indeed, for such a great event if it was done by immersion. If some of our immersionist friends were going to have such a baptism today, it would take at least a column in the daily paper to tell about it. They would have to select a suitable place to baptize so many people, and would have to make very elaborate preparations for such a great event. However, Luke tells us about it in a few brief words and he would seem to indicate that it was a very simple matter to baptize so many people. The Holy Ghost fell on the Church at about 9:00 A. M. When it was noised abroad that this had happened the crowd came together. Peter preached his sermon. The crowd was convicted and Peter took some time to tell them what to do. It must have been about noon, at least, when all of this had taken place. Yet the record tells us that all these three thousand people had been baptized and added to the church by sun-down that same day. That was quick work indeed, if it was done by immersion. It hardly seems possible that it could have been done in such a brief period of time if it was done by immersion.

The second thing we want you to consider about this case is the matter of place and conditions. Please remember that these people were baptized in Jerusalem. They were not baptized in Jordan. The river was a long distance from the city. There is no other stream of any size in or near Jerusalem. Neither was there a large pond or lake that could have been used for this purpose. In fact one of the great problems that has always faced the people of Jerusalem is the problem of getting a sufficient supply of water to meet their needs. Solomon spent great sums of money try-

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

ing to provide for that need. Other rulers have done the same thing. It is still one of the problems that confront the people of that city. It is better now, I am told, than it once was, but still water is very scarce there. We are told that men make their living by going around with skins of water selling it to the people for their use. The water that was available was very precious and the people prized it highly.

Then too, we must remember that the Church was despised by the leaders of that day. They had just killed Jesus to get rid of him, and they would not be wining for his despised followers to use any available body of water for such a purpose as baptizing converts to this despised religion. When these facts are taken into consideration, it seems to me that it rules out the possibility of these three thousand people being baptized by immersion. I just don't see how it could be done with those conditions prevailing.

However, when we consider another mode of baptism, the matter seems very simple. These people could easily have been sprinkled, in a brief period of time and with very little trouble. It would not take long for twelve men to walk through a crowd of three thousand people with a basin of water and a bunch of hyssop and sprinkle every one of them. Neither would it take a great amount of water. This could be done in an hour's time and with a small amount of water. These people had a precedent for doing just such a thing as that. Moses had done this very thing in cleansing the Children of Israel. I am convinced in my own mind that this is how it was done. I just can't believe it was done by immersion. In fact I don't see how it was possible to do it by immersion. Circumstantial evidence is all in favor of sprinkling and against immersion.

The second case that we ask you to consider is the baptism of Saul of Tarsus, who later was known as Paul. Now, according to Paul's testimony he was con-

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

verted on the road to Damascus. He tells us of how Christ struck him down and revealed himself to him as the true Messiah. When Paul arose from the ground, we are told that he was blind and those who journeyed with him took him by the hand and led him into the city. He spent three days in fasting and prayer. On the third day, God sent a man by the name of Ananias to him. When Ananias came into the house where Paul was stopping, he said, Acts 9:17-18, "Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou comest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales: and he received sight for with, and arose, and was baptized." (The Greek word that is translated *arose* in this passage is *anastas*, and it literally means standing up.)

Now this is the New Testament record of how Paul was baptized. There are several things that we would point out to you about this incident. In the first place we would remind you that Paul had been through a shocking experience that had shaken him to his depths. He had also spent three days in fasting and prayer. No doubt he was very weak in body and was not in any condition to travel any distance to seek for a place suitable for baptism by immersion. Certainly there is no reason to believe that there was a pool of water in this house, and, if there had been, it would not have been proper to use it for immersion. Water was a scarce article in that country. What water the people did have was used with care. In fact the Holy Land is hardly the place for a religion to arise that demands baptism by immersion as admittance into its fellowship. You would hardly expect such a teaching to come from a section where water is so scarce.

The next thing we would call to your attention is the fact that, so far as the record indicates, it was done without any fuss or preliminary preparation. They

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

just did it and it was over with. There is nothing to suggest that they left the house or sought a suitable place. What is true at this point in the case of Paul's baptism is also true of the record of all New Testament baptisms. They did it then and there without any great ado and it was over with.

Finally, we would call your attention to that statement, *standing up*. The record seems to say that he was baptized *standing up*. Now, if that was the case, then he could not have been baptized by immersion. It is out of the question to think that a person can be baptized by immersion standing up. Much of what has been said about the baptism of Paul could also be said of the case of the Philippian jailer and his household. They were baptized in the middle of the night and the record would certainly indicate that they did not leave the jail to seek a suitable place for baptism by immersion. We are told that Paul refused to leave the jail the next morning until the authorities came and took him out. We can't conceive of Paul stealing out of jail in the middle of the night to have a baptismal service, and then slip back and take such a stand the next morning. There is no record of there being sufficient water in the jail for baptism by immersion, and common sense would lead us to believe that there was not enough water for such a purpose. The burden of proof rests upon the immersionists to prove that there was enough water for such a thing, and circumstantial evidence is against them. We have reason; to conclude that it was done either by sprinkling or pouring. In the case of Paul, with his religious training and background, I would think he would lean toward the mode of sprinkling. He knew the Old Testament teaching on this subject. He would obey the law in this matter.

We next call your attention to the case of Cornelius and his household. The record of this is given in Acts 10:44-47. While Peter yet spake these words, the

WHY BAPTIZE, BY SPRINKLING

Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God. Then answered Peter, Can any man *forbid* water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?"

This is the New Testament record of this event. I want to call your attention to several things about the record. In the first place, I want to remind you that the Holy Ghost had just been *poured out upon* these people. The record makes this very plain. In fact it emphasizes the fact that it was done that way. Three different times in the Acts, where it speaks of this event, we are told that it *fell* upon them, or was *poured out* upon them. In Acts 11:16 Peter associates this event with the promise Christ made about the baptism of the Holy Ghost. The Greek word *baptizo* is used in this promise in the case when it was given in Acts 1:5 and also when Peter quotes it in Acts 11:16. *In the eyes of Peter pouring was baptism.* Now I am frank to confess that I can't believe that Peter would immerse people in water in order to baptize them when they had just been *baptized* with the Holy Ghost by pouring. In the eyes of our good immersionist friends the word *baptizo* might demand immersion, but certainly it would not with Peter, as he understood it. If they were baptized with the Holy Ghost by affusion, and they were, then we have reason to believe that Peter would use affusion in water baptism. That seems reasonable to me.

Then, too, I would like to remind you of the request that Peter made in connection with this event. He said, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized?" In other words, won't someone bring some water so these people may be baptized. I feel sure that none would be so silly as to think they

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

brought in sufficient water for all of this crowd to be immersed. The whole thing seems to indicate that it was done by affusion. Let our immersionist friends prove otherwise.

The final case that I call to your attention is that of the Ethiopian eunuch. The record of this is found in Acts 8:36-38, "And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him."

Now when we come to this particular case of baptism, our good immersion friends always brighten up and feel much better. They like that statement where it says, "they went down into the water." This, to them, seems to be conclusive proof that the eunuch had to be immersed in the water. They just can't see how a person could go down into water and not be immersed in the water.

However, before we are too sure that the eunuch was immersed in the water, I would like to call your attention to two facts that our good friends overlook. In the first place, I would like to remind you of where this baptism took place. Luke tells us that it was as you go down from Jerusalem unto Gaza, "*which is desert.*" In other words this baptism took place in a desert country. Now may I ask, What makes a desert country? There is but one answer to this question and that is this, the lack of water. If there was an abundance of water it would not be desert. The fact that it was desert is proof that there was not an abundance of water in that section. If there had been it would not have been a desert country. Now travelers tell us that in such country you do not find any large

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

bodies of water that would be sufficient for baptism by immersion. If there had been it would not have been a desert country. It is true that in such country you find small oases where there are watering places that are suitable to slake your thirst. Usually it is a small spring that seeps up in the sand, but certainly not large enough to immerse a grown man in. Then too, if it had been large enough for baptism by immersion, it would have been a violation of the unwritten law of the desert country to use it for such a purpose. The law of the desert was that only enough water for your actual need was to be taken, and the balance was to be left clean for the one who would follow you. For a person to be guilty of wasting or making such a place unfit to drink from would call down the judgment of all upon the offender. It is almost unthinkable that Philip would do such a thing. The words do not demand such a thing. It would have been very easy for them to have both walked down into the sunken place where the water was and used what they needed for baptism by sprinkling. This would fulfill the meaning of the word that is used, and is certainly the thing that must have happened in this case.

Another thing that makes us believe that this is what actually happened, is the passage the eunuch was reading when Philip joined himself to his chariot. Our good immersionist friends seem to have completely overlooked this angle of the event. It says in Acts that he was reading from the prophecy of Esaias (or Isaiah). If you will study the record carefully you will find that he was reading the section of this prophecy found in the 52nd and 53rd chapters. This was where he was in his reading when Philip joined him. We are told that Philip began at the same scripture and preached unto him Jesus.

Now, with these facts before us, may I call your attention to a thing that I have already mentioned several times before. In this passage Isaiah, speaking by

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

inspiration says, "So shall he *sprinkle many* nations," etc. The eunuch had just read this, and Philip had just applied this scripture and told him that it was Jesus of whom the Prophet was speaking. Now, in view of this fact, can you believe that the eunuch would ask for baptism by immersion? Would he want to be immersed when he had just read that-Jesus would sprinkle? I hardly think so. I believe if Philip had even suggested that he be immersed, he would have protested and asked for sprinkling. Don't you? It seems to me that when we take all things into consideration, we are forced to believe that the eunuch was sprinkled, in spite of the fact that they both went down into the water.

We recognize the fact that in all of these cases the evidence given is circumstantial. However, we believe it is strong circumstantial evidence. To our mind it carries a great deal of weight when taken all together. While we cannot be dogmatic and say positively that it was done in a certain way, we do believe that most of the evidence is in favor of affusion rather than immersion.

However, we may say again, that we do recognize immersion as one mode of baptism. We believe that according to the way the word is used in the New Testament, it would permit baptism by immersion. The only thing we are contending for is that the word does not always mean immersion. If it could be proved conclusively that certain people were baptized by immersion in New Testament times that would not affect our argument in the least. Our only contention is that the word may mean pour, sprinkle or immerse, and we feel that with all the evidence we have given, we have proved our point. We leave it to you to decide for yourself as to this contention. It does satisfy our own mind. It may be that you will not be convinced, but we are.

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

SOME ARGUMENTS FROM COMMON SENSE

Thus far, in dealing with this subject, we have confined ourselves almost entirely to the Bible. The only exception to this has been our reference to the book of Judith and the historian Josephus. We have pointed out that they used the word baptizo when the context clearly shows that it was done by sprinkling. We believe that these two references carry some weight in proving how the word was used in the times of Christ. However, we feel that the Bible must be the final source of authority on this whole subject. Whatever the Bible teaches must settle the question as to the proper mode of baptism. We are convinced in our minds that an appeal to the classical writers, or to definitions found in Greek lexicons will always give the classical definition of this word first. It is perfectly natural that they should do this. If we should go to a dictionary for the definition of a word in use today, we would of course find it defined as it is used by the scholar. We all know of many words that are used by the common people in a different way from that of the scholar. The same thing is true in the case of many words in the New Testament. The New Testament is written in the *Koine*, or the language of the common people. For this reason many words used in the New Testament have different shades of meaning from that of the classical. As an illustration, if you should look up the word grace in the dictionary or a lexicon, you would find a definition like this: grace is undeserved love or unmerited favor. This is good as far as it goes, but it does not begin to exhaust the rich full meaning of this word as Paul used it.

Then another thing that we need to remember when we consult the Greek lexicons for a definition of this word baptizo is this: the subject of baptism is a controversial subject. The editors and publishers are depending on all types of people to buy their lexicons

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

Therefore, they try to give a definition that will please all parties concerned. Sometimes in doing this they put themselves in a rather ridiculous position. As an illustration of this, I might say that I have a small Greek lexicon here with me as I write. In that lexicon we find this definition for the word *baptizo*, -lit. I dip, submerge, but specifically of ceremonial dipping (whether immersion or *affusion*), (I baptize). Now when you stop to analyze this definition it makes you feel like smiling as you watch this fellow try to straddle the fence. The idea of being dipped or immersed by *affusion* (sprinkling or pouring) is funny to say the least. It would take a lot of sprinkling or pouring to immerse a person. Now here is what this writer faces. He knows what the classical meaning of the word is, but he also knows that it does not always mean immerse as it is used in the New Testament, and so he tries to dissolve the difficulty by combining these two meanings of the word. However, in doing it he gets into trouble. It would have been far better if he had just given the classical meaning of the word and then pointed out that it was not always used with that sense in the New Testament. He should have stated that the word came to have a different meaning and use in the New Testament. This would have been true to the facts and would have saved him from getting into this awkward position. However, it might have given, some offense to the rabid immersionist.

While it is true that we must let the Bible settle the question as to the proper mode of baptism, we do believe that there are some other factors which enter into a discussion of this subject. We believe that common sense can throw some light on this subject. We have come to believe that the religion of Jesus Christ is the most sensible thing in all the world. It may not appeal to the carnal mind of the world, but to the regenerated child of God it appears to be the most sensible thing in the world. In fact I have come to believe

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

that the great truths in the Christian religion are true not just because they were spoken by Jesus. Jesus taught them because they were true. They are not true just before they are written in the Bible, but they are written in the Bible because they are true. They would be true if Jesus never had taught them. They would be true if they had never been written in the Bible. They are written into the very foundation of the universe. They are also written into the very fibre of our being. The highest form of wisdom and knowledge is to be found in God's plan for our lives. When we find that and make it a part of our life, then we have reached the highest realm of wisdom and knowledge. The Christian religion does not violate our better judgment and higher self. There is something in me that admits the truths of it. It not only appeals to my heart, but it also satisfies my mind. I give consent unto the law that it is good.

Now if what we have just said is true, and I do believe with all my heart that it is true, then we have a right to believe that our Lord would not institute an ordinance or sacrament, which admits us into the fellowship of his church, that would either offend our sense of decency or common sense. Jesus was not a stickler for forms and ceremonies. He clashed many times with the scribes and Pharisees of his day, because he would not be bound by their petty rules and customs. Jesus was not a rabid fanatic on the subject of baptism. In fact, in the eyes of many people today, he would be considered careless and guilty of criminal neglect along this line. He could cast a legion of demons out of a man and send him back home without ever being baptized. He could heal the leper, the lame, the blind and send them away with the assurance that their sins were forgiven, and yet, he never baptized them. He could forgive fallen men and women and send them away in peace without baptism of any kind. He did not seem to put the stress on this matter

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

that some of his followers do today. That does not mean that we are to drop the matter and quit baptizing people. The same Lord has commanded us to baptize all nations, in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. I have merely pointed out these facts in order to show you that Jesus was not a rabid formalist or a stickler for form and ceremonies. There were many other things that were of far more importance in his eyes. He was far more concerned that the heart should be cleansed from sin than he was that the body should be washed. He said it was not what went into a man that defiled, but it was what came out.

Now, with these thoughts in mind, I want to say that I can't conceive of Christ instituting an ordinance or sacrament in the Christian church that could not be observed at any time or under any conditions. We Protestants believe and teach that there are two great sacraments in the Christian Church. One of them is the Lord's Supper and the other is Baptism. Baptism is the initial sacrament that gives us admittance into the fellowship of the church. There are many places in the world where baptism by immersion is absolutely out of the question. There are many places where, if people were converted, it would be out of the question to try and immerse them in water. Just a few months ago there were hundreds of boys being killed in the hot burning desert of Africa. Today, as I write these lines, there are thousands and perhaps millions of men dying on the battlefields of Russia. The thermometer is hovering below zero, and the cold north winds sweep over those fields. Let us just picture the chaplain as he moves around among those men. He finds a dying boy and lifts his head into his lap and points him to the Lamb of God for salvation. The boy believes and is saved. If he is in Russia then the cold would kill him, if he were immersed. If he is in the desert, then there is no water. Can you imagine that chaplain sitting down to write that boy's

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

mother and saying to her, "I was with your boy in his dying moments, and I am happy to inform you that he gave a testimony that his sins were forgiven, and that he was going home to be with Jesus. I did all for him that could be done with *one exception*. I did not baptize him. I would have been glad to have done it, but *it so happens that our Lord instituted a mode of baptism that could not be administered at that time.*" The very thought of such a thing is shocking to me. I just can't and don't believe that Jesus did any such thing. It may be all right to immerse some people. I have no objection to it at all. However, I can never believe that Jesus prescribed one mode, and only one, and, too, that He prescribed a mode that could not be administered anywhere and at any time. I just can't accept that. It does violence to my conception of Jesus, and I believe I have a Bible conception of him.

When it comes to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper you can administer it anywhere and under almost any kind of conditions. All that is needed for this is a small pinch of bread and a sip of wine. It can be given to a dying boy either in the hot desert of Africa, or on the cold bleak plains of Russia. It can be given to the sick and dying, as well as those who are alive and healthy. The same is true of baptism by sprinkling. I can sprinkle a person, anywhere and under any kind of conditions. All that is needed is a very small amount of water and it can be done.

During my years in the ministry I have been called upon to baptize people by sprinkling, who had been taught to believe that the only true mode of baptism was immersion. However, they were sick and could not be immersed and I was requested to do it by sprinkling. One case was that of a young man who had been gassed in the World War. He was a member of a Baptist home and was going to join the Baptist Church. His pastor asked me to go to his home and sprinkle him since he was not physically able to be im-

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

mersed. The pastor asked me to do this and to promise that I would not tell it. As we walked out of that home I put my arm around this good Baptist brother, who was a very close friend of mine and said, "I hope this will be a lesson to you." I said, "Can't you see that Jesus would never insist upon one certain mode of baptism when it is *impossible* to practice it in many instances."

I was once called upon to help baptize the mother-in-law of a Baptist preacher. She could not be immersed on account of physical conditions, and yet, she wanted to be baptized before she died and her son-in-law sent for me to do it, by sprinkling. We are told that C. H. Spurgeon, the great Baptist Divine, had to give up the practice of baptizing people by immersion in his old age on account of his health. He was still well enough to stand in the pulpit and preach the gospel, but his health would not permit him to immerse people. He had to get some one else to do it for him. He did not give up his views on the mode of baptism but he did have to quit doing it to protect his health. There are thousands of people in the world today, who absolutely could not be immersed if they should be saved. Either their health or their surroundings would not permit it to be done in that way. They could easily be sprinkled, or have water poured on their heads, but immersion is out of the question.

Now, my dear reader, you may be able to get yourself to believe that Jesus instituted one and only one mode of baptism, and that by immersion; but I just can't do it. I just can't believe that Jesus would institute a mode and shut us up to that one mode alone, especially if it was impossible to practice that mode at any time and under any kind of conditions. Jesus intended to institute a world-wide religion. He meant that all men should be reached by it. I am convinced that He would take this into consideration when He adopted baptism as the initiatory rite into His church.

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

I believe He did, and I believe He made it so that people can be baptized anywhere and under any kind of conditions. That is just what we have been trying to set forth in this book. Immersion may be one proper mode of baptism, but I just can't believe it is the only mode. My mind just won't consent to that, knowing Jesus as I do. I have not so learned of Christ.

In the writings of the early Church Fathers, five find no record of where baptism by immersion only is advocated, until the time of Tertullian in the second century. He is the first known advocate of immersion only, as the true mode of baptism. He has many followers today, but in his day he stood alone on this question.

We are also told that in the Catacombs at Rome there are many drawings to be found, which picture Christian baptism being done either by pouring or sprinkling. There is not a single picture in the catacombs of baptism by immersion. These people lived very near to the Apostolic age, and, no doubt, knew what the custom was at that time. They were not people who had been influenced by the decree of some Pope, or who just did things for the sake of convenience. They were people who were willing to suffer and die for their faith. To me their testimony is convincing.

With all of these facts before us, I feel safe in saying that the Bible does not teach baptism by immersion only. I am forced to believe that it may be done either by sprinkling, pouring or immersion. In the New Testament the word means ceremonial cleansing, regardless of how it might be done. MY DEAR READER WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT IT?

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

In my travels I have met one Baptist minister who contended that the Hebrew word *nazah*, which is translated sprinkle in Isaiah 52:15, should have been translated into the English word *astonish* or *startle*. In other words, the sentence should have read, "So shall he astonish (or startle) many nations," instead of "So shall he sprinkle many nations."

Now I want to say emphatically that there is no ground whatever for such a contention, except the desire to dodge the implications of this statement. You don't have to be a Hebrew scholar to see that I am right. If you will turn to your Analytical Concordance, you will find this word defined, and also a list of the places where it is used in the Old Testament. You will find that it is used 24 times in all in the Old Testament, and in *not one single instance will it bear the meaning astonish or startle*. It means to sprinkle just as the translators gave it. It is used in speaking of sprinkling blood, sprinkling oil, sprinkling water. It is used in speaking of sprinkling the sons of Levi. It is used in speaking of sprinkling the unclean and the leper, and in every instance it must mean sprinkle and can't mean to startle or astonish. To so translate it would make every passage where it is used sound ridiculous. The only other translation that could possibly be given to this verse would be, "So shall he cleanse (or purify) many nations." If this translation should be used, it would naturally convey the idea of sprinkling, for that is the way it was done in those days. This is but another proof that we are right in our contention that the word *baptizo* means cleanse or purify.

On page 15 we refer to a passage in the writings of Josephus where he uses the Greek word, **baptizo**, and it means to **sprinkle**. The passage to which we refer is found in: Jewish Antiquities, by Josephus, book 4 and chapter 4. The passage reads: "**Baptizing** (Greek **baptizontes**) by this ashes, put into spring water, they **sprinkle** on the third day and the seventh day." So we see in this case where even a man like Josephus uses the word, **baptizo**, and it means to sprinkle. Surely Josephus knew how the word should be used.

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

APPENDIX

NEW TESTAMENT GREEK

In this treatise we have taken the position that the New Testament is not written in classical Greek. It may seem to some people that this is an unsound and an arbitrary position to take. To show that this is not the case we will give a few quotations from some of the outstanding Greek scholars. We will first quote from "A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament" (by H. E. Dana, Th.D., Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, Texas, and Julius R. Mantey, Th.D., D. D., Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the Northern Baptist Theological Seminary in Chicago, Ill.). These two great Greek scholars worked together in preparing this book and dedicated it to Rev. Lee Rutland Scarborough, D. D., who is one of the great Baptist ministers of this day. I feel that what these men have to say about the language of the New Testament ought to be acceptable to all our good immersionist friends.

In the Preface of their book in page 8 they have this to say, "The true light, in the full glow of whit', we now labor, dawned in 1824. Its earliest gleams found entrance through the mind and work of Johann Winer, whose Grammar first appeared in 1824. Winer's work was epoch-making in the highest degree. A grateful multitude of New Testament students are ready to join A. T. Robertson in his admiring declaration that 'in a true sense he was a pathfinder.' He introduced a revolution into the study of the Greek New Testament by adopting and substantiating the premise that Biblical Greek, and particularly that of the New Testament, was not a special 'Holy Ghost' language, nor a conglomeration of Greek words and

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

Semitic grammar, but the *ordinary colloquial tongue of the day*, spoken throughout the Graeco-Roman world. The idea has remained since his day an axiom in the study of the Greek New Testament."

In the Introduction of this book we find these two statements. On page 6, paragraph 3, "The *Koine* Period. This period extends from 330 B. C. to A. D. 330. It is the period of the common or universal Greek. During this period the Greek language was freely used and understood throughout the civilized world, being spoken as freely on the streets of Rome, Alexandria, and Jerusalem as in Athens."

On page 9 under the general heading "The Greek of the New Testament," we find this statement. "There was a time when the scholars who dealt with the original text of the New Testament regarded its Greek as a special Holy Ghost language, prepared under divine direction for the Scripture writers. . . . But beginning with Winer in 1824 there came a revolution in the views of New Testament scholarship relative to this matter. As a result of the labors of Deissmann in Germany, Moulton in England, and Robertson in America all question has been removed from this conclusion that New Testament Greek is simply a sample of the colloquial Greek of the first century, i. e., *the Koine Greek. The inspired writers of the New Testament wrote in the ordinary language of the masses, as might have been expected.*" Prof. A. T. Robertson shows that the progress of opinion among New Testament Greek scholars has been for more than half a century toward the conclusion *now universally accepted that the Greek of the New Testament is but a specimen of the vernacular Koine of the first century.* He deals extensively with the witness of the inscriptions and papyri to this fact." (Italic type ours).

Now this is just exactly what we have contended for in this book. There was a time when it would be

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

natural for people to be misled and influenced by the classical Greek. They did not have the light on the language that we have today. However, there is no excuse for us to be misled. We know what language was used and we can now let the New Testament speak for itself. It does in very clear tones when we come to it with our minds cleared of preconceived ideas and definitions.

SOME QUESTIONS FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION.

Did John the Baptist administer Christian baptism?

Did John baptize either in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; or in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ?

If John's baptism was Christian baptism, then why did Paul *re-baptize* the disciples that he found at Ephesus? See Acts 19:5.

If John's baptism was not Christian baptism, then where and when did Christian baptism really begin and who first administered it?

In John 4:2 we find this statement, "Though Jesus Himself baptized not, but his disciples."

Now, if John's baptism was not Christian baptism and Jesus did not baptize anyone, then when and where did the Apostles receive Christian baptism, and who administered it to them? If you can answer please write me and give me book, chapter and verse.

IS WATER BAPTISM ESSENTIAL TO SALVATION?

Since I first had this book printed I have had a number of letters from that group of believers, known as The Church of Christ, and they have objected very strongly to my interpretation of the passage in John

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINGLING

3:5. They contend that in this statement, where Jesus speaks of being born of water, that He is speaking of water baptism and therefore water baptism is essential to salvation. Since they do make such strong contentions along this line, and since my interpretation may seem novel and new to some of my readers, then let us examine a little more closely just what this verse does mean. Now in my book I contend, that what Jesus is talking about when He says that a person must be born of water, is the *natural birth*. In other words He says you must not only be born *naturally* but you must also be born of the Spirit in order to become a member of His Kingdom. Those who have objected to this interpretation say that it means water baptism. At least we are all agreed on this one point and that is this: whatever Jesus is saying when He speaks of being born of water He also says that a person must be born of the Spirit in order to enter into the Kingdom of God. In other words John 3:5 says you have to be *born twice*. Then if being born of water is to be baptized with water then Jesus should have said in the 7th verse, "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born *twice more*." However, if I am right in my contention that He was speaking of natural birth then it was proper for Jesus to say, "Ye must be born *again*." For Nicodemus had already been born once by nature and so he only needed the birth of the Spirit to make him a member of the Kingdom. According to the contention of our good friends in the Church of Christ then really Jesus meant to say that Nicodemus had to be born *twice more*, that is *of water and of the Spirit* and Jesus should never have used the word *again*, He should have used some word that would indicate *two definite births*, for that is what they contend. When I went to school my teacher told me that *and* is a conjunction that joins *two* words, phrases, or clauses. In other words it joins two different things together. In John 3:5, *and*, joins the birth of water and the birth

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

of the Spirit. So according to the teaching of our good friends, who differ with me, every person that has been born naturally also needs two *other births* in order to get them into the Kingdom of God. I believe that only two births are necessary. One of them is natural and the other is the birth of the Spirit. Jesus said, "Ye must be born *again*, that means just one more time after you have been born physically.

Then too, if Jesus meant to teach that water baptism is absolutely essential to salvation, then why did He not make Himself clear in answering the question of Nicodemus, when he said, "How can these things be?" Jesus answered him by saying, "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." He should have said, "Whosoever believeth *and is baptized*, shall have eternal life." In verse 18 He also should have said, "He that believeth *and is baptized is* not condemned." In fact if being born of water means water baptism then it should come before being born of the Spirit for that is the way Jesus puts it in John 3:5. In other words, if He meant water baptism when He spoke of being born of water, then He gives water baptism priority over the birth of the Spirit. He also should have said in John 3:36, "He that believeth on the Son, *and is baptized*, hath everlasting life." Then in John 6:47 He also should have said, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me, *and is baptized*, hath everlasting life." Strange to say in none of these instances does Jesus say any such thing. Neither does Paul in that great passage in Romans 10:6-11. In this great passage Paul is telling people how to *be saved* and yet he *says nothing whatever about water baptism*.

Paul says, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto right-

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

eousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Nothing whatever is said here about being baptized in order to be saved. It is a matter of faith and confession with the mouth.

Our good friends in the Church of Christ contend that *faith and water baptism* put you into Christ, saves you, washes away your sins, and makes you a member of the Kingdom. If they are right in their contention then what about the case of Simon in Acts 8:9-23. In Acts 8:13 we are told, "Then Simon himself believed also: and when he was *baptized* he continued with Philip, etc."

However just a little later we are told that Peter and John came down to pray for these new converts that they might receive the Holy Ghost, and when the Spirit was poured out on them Simon did not get the blessing. He came around and tried to buy this blessing, and Peter told him why he did not get the blessing. In Acts 8:21 and 23 we find these words: "Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: *for thy heart is not right in the sight of God.* For I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness, and in the bonds of iniquity." Now here is a man that had believed also; and *been baptized*, and yet according to Peter's statement his heart was not right in the sight of God, he was in the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity. If baptism does what they claim it does then there is something wrong here. This seems to be one case where water baptism falls down. However there is another baptism that does not fall down and that is when you are baptized by the Spirit of God into the body of Christ and into His death.

If water baptism is absolutely essential to salvation then that makes your salvation dependent upon man and some man could keep you out of the Kingdom of God. We don't believe in that.

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

ONE FAITH, ONE LORD, ONE BAPTISM

Mr. James R. Cope, of Henderson, Tenn., who is a member of the Church of Christ, has paid me a great compliment in the fact that he has written a book trying to refute this book of mine on, "Why Baptize By Sprinkling?" In the close of his book he makes this statement, "It would have been interesting to observe the Doctor's handling of Paul's statement, "There is one Lord, one faith, *one baptism* (Eph. 4:5) in view of his contention that there are three-Sprinkling, pouring and immersion, but for some reason best known to himself he left well enough alone. Dr. Church admits that immersion is baptism, and just as surely as there is one true Lord and one true faith, just that certain is there one true baptism and that baptism is immersion."

I have written to Brother Cope and told him why I did not take up this statement about one baptism, but since all of our good immersionist friends make so much of this statement I feel justified in telling the reading public why I did not bring it into my book. The reason why I did not bring it into my book is because it has no place there. I was discussing *water baptism* and when Paul speaks of *one baptism* he is not speaking of *water baptism*. He is speaking of the Spirit baptism that puts you into Christ. See 1 Cor. 12:13: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, etc." Certainly Paul is not saying there is only one *mode* of baptism. Now dear reader let me submit the same questions that I submitted to my good friend and brother in Christ, Mr. James R. Cope, and then you decide for yourself which is the one baptism. In the New Testament we are told about *John's baptism*, about being baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, and about the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Now which of these do you think is the *one baptism*? In Acts 1:5 Jesus speaks of John baptizing with water, 'but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

days hence." Which of these do you think Jesus would call *the one baptism*?

In Acts 8:12 we are told about the people at Samaria being baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and then a few days later Peter and John went down and prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost. Now which of these do you think is *the one baptism*? Which had you rather have?

In Acts 9:17, 18, we are told about Ananias going down to Saul of Tarsus in order that he might receive his sight, *and be filled with the Holy Ghost*. After that Ananias *baptized* him. Now which of these do think is *the one baptism*? Which would you prefer? Which do you have?

In Acts 10:44-47 we have the record of Cornelius and his household getting the *baptism* of the Holy Ghost, and then after that Peter *baptized* them *with water*. Now which of these do you think is the more important? Which do you think Peter, Paul, or Jesus would designate as the one *baptism*? Which had you rather have? You may have both if you want them.

In Acts 19:1-12 we have the record of *three baptisms* in the case of the Ephesian disciples that Paul found there.

First, they had been baptized unto *John's baptism*.

Second, Paul *re-baptized* them in the name of the Lord Jesus.

Third, Paul laid his hands on them and prayed for them that they might receive the *baptism of the Holy Ghost*. Now since Paul is the one that used the expression, *one baptism*, which of these *three baptisms* do you think Paul would designate as the *one baptism*?

Jesus never baptized anyone *with water*. He came to baptize with the Holy Ghost, and this is the only baptism that He has ever administered to anyone. Yet strange to say there are multitudes of people that make a great hue and cry about the proper mode of water baptism and never seek the baptism of the Holy Ghost.

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

Thank God we can have both if we will pay the price. "The promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Acts 2:39.

I thank God that I do not have to do without either water baptism or the baptism of the Holy Ghost, but if I did have to do without either of these baptisms, and had my choice of which I was to do without, then I would certainly choose to do without water baptism and beg for the baptism of the Holy Ghost. "Have you received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? Acts 19:2. Be not drunk with wine wherein is excess, but be filled with the Spirit. And Jesus being assembled together with them, *commanded* them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, *but wait for the promise of the Father*, which saith he, ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Acts 1:4, 5.

There is one Lord and He is our Blessed Lord and Savior. *He has a baptism* that the world knows not of, and that *is the one baptism that is above all others*. The baptism of the Holy Ghost is as far superior to water baptism as Jesus was superior to John the Baptist. Amen and Amen!

WHY BAPTIZE BY SPRINKLING

WATER BAPTISM AND THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY GHOST ARE NOT THE SAME.

The case of Simon at Samaria in Acts 8:12-23, and the case of the twelve disciples that Paul found at Ephesus, Acts 19:1-12, forever does away with that erroneous teaching that water baptism and the baptism of the Holy Ghost are one and the same thing. It also forever does away with that idea that the baptism of the Holy Ghost comes to a person when they are baptized with water. In the case of Simon we are told that he was baptized, but he did not even receive the Holy Ghost when Peter and John prayed for the others to get this blessing. In the case of the twelve disciples we see that a person can be *baptized twice with water* and still not have the baptism of the Holy Ghost. When Paul went down there they had already been baptized unto John's baptism, and then when Paul was there he re-baptized them in the name of the Lord Jesus, but even then they did not have the baptism of the Holy Ghost. After they had been baptized *with water twice* then Paul had to lay his hands on them and pray for them that they might receive the baptism of the Holy Ghost. These two cases forever refute the teaching of certain people that you receive the baptism of the Holy Ghost when you are baptized with water. Truly the Word of God is a light to our feet, and a lamp to our pathway. The entrance of God's Word giveth light and liberty. Where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty from error and bondage to man and man's ideas. Whom the Lord makes free, is free indeed. I do thank God that I ever found this way!

OTHER BOOKS

By

Dr. John R. Church

A Bird's Eye View of God's Plan	25c
Why Do The Righteous Suffer	25c
Security in Christ; or Kept by the Indwelling Christ.....	25c
Earthen Vessels; or the Human Element in Holiness.....	25c
A Second Grace; or An Adequate Remedy for Sin	25c
Why Baptize by Sprinkling.	25c
Religion In The Home	25c
Did Jesus Believe in Eternal Punishment?	25c
Is God Responsible for Our Temptation?	25c
The All-Sufficiency of Christ.....	25c
After the A and H Bomb, What.....	25c
Which Is Right-One, Two or Three Works of Grace?	50c

Order from

PENTECOSTAL PUBLISHING COMPANY

Box 774, Louisville, Ky.