

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXV.—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, MDCCLXXXIV.

ARTICLE I.

DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN.

Doctrine of Original Sin, as Received and Taught by the Churches of the Reformation, Stated and Defended. By the Rev. Dr. R. W. LANDIS. Whittet & Shepperson, Richmond, Va., pp. 541.

This is a posthumous work of Dr. Landis, Professor of Theology in the Danville Theological Seminary, Kentucky. It arose out of a discussion between him and the admirers of Dr. Charles Hodge, touching the doctrine of the latter about the manner of the imputation of Adam's sin to the race, which Dr. Landis conducted in the DANVILLE and the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEWS. He complained that the supporters of Dr. Hodge in the Northern Church, to which Dr. Landis belonged, resented all criticism of their leader in a factious, tyrannical, and popish spirit, which refused to give a fair hearing to the truth, and even punished him for daring to assert that truth against their great man. Hence Dr. Landis felt that no resource was left him, in defending God's cause and his own good name, except the publication of his full views and their grounds. He therefore devoted the latter years of his life and the riches of his own magnificent theological library to the laborious and careful composition of

conclusion to remind our authors and all of like mind with them that *criticism of sources* is not to be confined to those who wrote two thousand years ago—that modern writers, too, may be ordered to stand and give account of their authorities—especially when they are found fashioning strange stories—(may we be allowed one word of Greek?)—

ὄθεν κέ τις οὐδε ἰδοίτο.

BENJ. B. WARFIELD.

ARTICLE VII.

AN EXPOSITION OF ROMANS VI. 4.

Perhaps no portion of God's word has been less understood, and more perverted, than the one which the writer now proposes to expound. Some of the most dangerous errors of the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches in ancient times had their origin in a wrong interpretation of this Scripture; and beyond doubt, many of the injurious and false teachings of Baptists, Campbellites, and Mormons in modern days had the same origin. This text, misunderstood and perverted, has in all ages been the main resource of immersionists, from Tertullian and others in the second century down to J. R. Graves, Alexander Campbell, and Joe Smith the Mormon, in this nineteenth century. Therefore, before proceeding to a direct exposition of the text, we will first storm and capture this stronghold of the immersionists, and instead of spiking their big gun, will turn it heavily loaded against their vulnerable ranks. "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Now, please to observe here, that God's word in this text affirms that by baptism we are buried into *death*, while immersionists teach that we ought to be buried into *water*. The Lord teaches one thing, and immersionists teach another and very different thing. Death is one thing, water is quite another

VOL. XXXV., NO. 4—12.

thing. The Lord buries his people into *death*. Immersionists bury their followers into water. Such is the very wide and irreconcilable difference between the Lord of glory and the immersionists. Whom shall we follow, the immersionists or the Lord? We say, the Lord.

But, say the immersionists, the water is implied in the text, even if it is not expressly named, because there can be no baptism without water. Not so fast, if you please. Not so thought John the Baptizer, when he said that Christ should baptize "with [or in] the Holy Ghost" (Mark iii. 3). Not so thought the Lord Jesus, when he said to his disciples, "Ye shall be baptized with [or in] the Holy Ghost" (Acts i. 5). Not so thought the inspired apostle Paul, when he said, "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body" (1 Cor. xii. 13). There may, therefore, be, and there certainly is, a scriptural and very precious baptism without water. What right has any mortal man to see or read water between the lines, when the Lord has not put water, but rather death, in the line? Who has the right to alter and amend the word of God by striking out the word *death* and inserting the word *water*? Let him who dares to do the deed, answer to God for his heaven-daring impiety.

And yet no longer ago than last May, we heard an immersionist utter in a sermon the following assertion: "We read in the Scriptures that in the days of the apostles, when any one wished to be baptized, he went down into the water, was buried in it, and then came up out of it." Next day when respectfully asked to tell where the Scriptures said anything about a burial in water, he referred to the very text on which we are now commenting, thus showing that he had erased the word *death* from this text and had amended it by inserting water. And he stands not alone in his sin. Thousands of others are constantly doing the same thing; and after thus shamefully interpolating this Scripture, they flout the false charge in the face of all others that they are unbaptized because they have not been buried in water, and therefore that they are unfit for a place at the Lord's table. "O shame, where is thy blush?"

Again, it is wholly from this text and the similar one in Col.

ii. 12 that immersionists derive their absurd theory that water-baptism is a sign or symbol of the burial and resurrection of Christ and his people. Now let us consider this shallow theory. According to the faith of all Christians, both orthodox and heretic, the sacrament of the Supper symbolises Christ and his work for our salvation. And according to the faith of multitudes of good Christians, the only other sacrament, which is baptism with water, symbolises the Holy Spirit and his indispensable work in and upon our hearts for our regeneration and sanctification. Christ's work and the Spirit's work make up the *whole* of our salvation. And thus, according to this scriptural and common-sense theory, the only two sacraments in the Christian Church symbolise and visibly set forth the whole of our redemption. But immersionists, who erroneously make water-baptism symbolise the burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ, have no sacrament at all to tell them anything about the blessed Spirit and his gracious work, without which no man can be saved. Thus, according to their lame theory, the half of our salvation remains untaught and unrepresented by divine sacramental symbols. What symbolises the Spirit and his operations if water baptism does not? Verily, as the prophet declares, "The legs of the lame are not equal." Moreover, why should we have two sacraments to symbolise our one Lord Christ? Immersionists will answer: one of these sacraments reminds us of our Lord's death, and the other of his burial and resurrection. But we reply, that it is wholly unscriptural and unwarrantable to confine the sacrament of the Supper to the *death* of Christ. When he instituted this sacrament, he said to his disciples, "This do in remembrance of ME" (Luke xxii. 19). Observe well that the Lord says, "in remembrance of *me*," and not simply in remembrance of my death. While this sacrament does remind Christians of their Redeemer's death, it also, at the same time, reminds them of him and of his whole life and work. The Christian at the Lord's table, who does not remember Jesus from the manger in Bethlehem to his mediatorial throne in glory, fails more or less to obey his Lord's dying command, "This do in remembrance of me." Where, then, is there a need of another sacrament to remind us of the Lord Jesus Christ? But, still

further, why should we have any sacrament at all to remind us of the *burial* of Christ? Does his *burial* avail anything towards our salvation? The Scriptures affirm again and again that Christ was born for us, lived for us, humbled himself for us, prayed for us, taught for us, obeyed for us, suffered for us, was made a curse for us, died for us, arose for us, and ascended to heaven for us; but where is it even hinted that *he was buried for us*? From the word of God we can see no reason why our redemption would not have been just as complete as it now is, even if Christ had not been buried at all. And in the name of the Lord, and in behalf of his sacred cause, we call on all the advocates of the burial theory of water baptism to point out even one text of Scripture which teaches plainly that Christ's *burial* avails anything towards our redemption, or that the baptism with water was instituted to remind us of the *burial* of our divine Redeemer. But we know well that no mortal man can comply with this reasonable demand for a "thus saith the Lord." Therefore we demand again, in the name of the Lord, why should we believe and teach, as immersionists erroneously do, that one of the only two sacraments in the Christian Church was instituted to remind us of an event in our Lord's history, when that event does no Christian any good whatever, while we will thus be left without any sacrament at all to remind us of the blessed Spirit and of his all-important operations, without which no human soul can be saved? Such an ignoring of the gracious Spirit and of his divine work of grace must be very offensive to his loving and tender heart. But to speak the whole truth on this point, it should be said that Christ was not really buried at all. He was simply laid temporarily in Joseph's new tomb, to remain there no longer than the continuance of the Sabbath, which was so near at hand when he died that his friends had only time sufficient to give him then a hasty temporary interment before the beginning of the Sabbath. And therefore we are told that, when his friends went to his sepulchre early on the morning of the third day, they carried with them the spices which they had prepared for his burial (Mark xvi. 1 and Luke xxiii. 56). Hence our Lord's burial was never completed, because, when they arrived at his grave to bury

him, they found that he had already risen and had left the place of his temporary interment. Yes, the burial theory of water baptism is wholly unscriptural and unreasonable, and therefore, we ask, can water baptism be valid, when the administrator of it perverts its meaning by teaching that he baptizes his converts in order to remind them and others of the burial of Christ, instead of teaching correctly, as John the Baptizer did, saying, "I baptize you with water, but he [Christ] shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost"? If, in administering the Lord's Supper, we should teach the people that the Supper must be eaten in remembrance of the Holy Ghost, would that Supper be a valid sacrament? We trow not. In like manner, we can see no validity in the sacrament of baptism when the administrator perverts or destroys its significancy by falsely teaching the people that it symbolises the burial and resurrection of Christ.

But now let the theory of the immersionists be turned against their practice. Let us, for the moment, suppose that water baptism does symbolise our Lord's burial; let us further suppose that we ought to be baptized with water in the same way in which Christ was buried, or in which the dead are usually buried. Then what will follow? Why, of course it will follow that the practice of immersionists in baptizing is wholly at fault. Who ever saw a dead man walk down into his own grave, as all immersed persons do walk into what they unscripturally style their "liquid graves"? Who ever saw a dead man rise out of his grave as soon as he has been put into it? Christ did not walk into his temporary tomb; neither was he thrust or plunged into it, as immersionists are plunged into their "liquid graves." Christ's temporary resting-place was a room cut out of a solid rock above ground, with a door in the side, and resembled an ordinary house more than a "liquid grave" or any other grave; and when he was reverently borne into it, the act of burying him was very much like the act of men bearing a dead man into the room of an ordinary dwelling-house, but not at all like the act of an immersionist plunging a man into a "liquid grave" in some muddy creek or river. But we have often heard immersionists say that people ought to be baptized just as they will be

buried when dead. Well, when our friends die, do we take them out to the grave-yard and then push, thrust, or plunge them into the earth just as immersionists push, thrust, or plunge their converts into a "liquid grave"? We trow not. No, we lay them gently down, and then pour or put the *earth upon them*, just as we put clean water upon the living man when we baptize him with water. Hence this champion text of the immersionists is *against them* and in our favor, even if it does teach that water baptism is a burial.

Furthermore, in this connexion, immersionists make much use of the verse following the text under consideration: "For if we have been *planted* together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." And they often ask us, with an air of triumph, "If you should sprinkle a little handful of earth upon a dead man's head, could you say that you had planted or buried him?" By way of reply, we ask them a reasonable question, How does the planter plant his seed? Does he plant as the immersionist baptizes? Does he throw, thrust, or plunge the seed into the earth? Or does he not rather put the earth *upon* the seed, just as we baptize by putting the water upon the subject? Therefore, if baptism with water be either a burial or a planting, the practice of immersionists is wholly wrong, and they must amend either their theory or their practice, for they are as wide apart as the distant poles. Let them, therefore, put the water on their converts just as they put the earth on their dead friends, and just as they put the earth on their seed when they bury or plant; or let them abandon their absurd theory that water baptism is a burial. Their favorite text, even on their own theory, is fully against them and wholly in our favor.

But observe further. When immersionists attempt to define the original of the word baptize, they persistently insist upon giving it what they incorrectly style its *primary* meaning, immerse. Now, we will turn the tables on them by giving the *primary* meaning of the original word in the text translated "buried," which is *burned up*. Hence, if we take the *primary* meaning of the Greek word, we might translate thus: "Therefore we are

burned up with him by baptism into death," etc., or more briefly, we are burned to death. And such a translation would bring us much nearer to a correct understanding of the text than we could possibly derive by listening to the watery harangues of immersionists upon the subject. There are many facts to sustain such a translation. Paul wrote this text in Greek, and he uses a Greek word which originally signified to burn up, or consume into ashes. He wrote to the Romans; and it is well known that the Greeks, Romans, and other ancient peoples usually burned up their dead, as some people, even in these United States, now do. Now we ask, what resemblance is there between burning up a dead body and plunging a living body into the water?

But lastly, immersionists teach that water baptism symbolises the *resurrection* as well as the burial of Christ, and they base their faith in such a theory wholly on this text. And it is true that, while this verse says nothing at all about Christ's burial, it does speak very plainly of his resurrection. But does it say that, as Christ was raised up from the dead, even so must we be raised up out of the water, or out of a "liquid grave"? Far from it. And yet that is exactly the construction which immersionists give to this latter part of the verse. Hence all their nonsensical twaddle about "liquid graves," and being raised up out of "liquid graves," just as Christ was raised up out of his grave, and of following Christ into and out of the grave, etc., etc. "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." That is the teaching of inspiration. "That like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should be raised up from a 'liquid grave.'" The latter is the teaching of the immersionists. And such is the manner in which they mutilate, interpolate, and amend or alter the sacred Scriptures. And on the strength of such perversions of God's word, they complacently assert: We are the people of God. We are the only true Church, and all others are outsiders and not fit to eat and to drink with us. Alas! alas!!

Thus have we fulfilled our promise to storm and capture the stronghold of the immersionists, and to turn their big gun,

heavily charged and shotted, against their broken and demoralised ranks. And now, with their big gun, let us give the Baptists a parting shot. If Baptists are justified in making this verse teach a water baptism and a literal burial of the living body in a liquid grave, then they are wholly unjustifiable in their bitter opposition to Alexander Campbellism. The latter part of this fourth verse positively affirms that after we have been buried with Christ by baptism into death, we arise "to walk in newness of life." Therefore nothing can be plainer than the fact that Paul is here speaking of a baptism which washes away sin and renews the soul; and, therefore, if he here speaks of a water baptism, he must assuredly be teaching that water baptism does effectually wash away sin and renew the soul, which is Campbellism. And therefore, upon their own theory, the Baptists are in error and the Campbellites are right; and consequently every Baptist, to be consistent, ought to join the Campbellite Church and believe and teach as they do, namely, that not "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son," but *water*, "cleanseth us from all sin."

And now a farewell shot at the Campbellites. If Campbellites are right in teaching that sin is washed away by or in water baptism, they all ought to forsake their own Church and join the Mormons, who by immersion in water wash away their sins every Sabbath day. All men sin every week; and if immersion in water will wash away sin, all men, including Campbellites, cannot be immersed too often.

What has been said is not intended as an assertion, or even an insinuation, that there are not vast multitudes of good Christian people in the Baptist denomination. Far from our heart be such a thought! But we do not only insinuate, but also assert, that the Baptist who stops short of Campbellism and Mormonism, after arriving at the conclusion that Paul speaks of water baptism in this text, and that therefore water baptism is a water burial, acts inconsistently and illogically, and ought not to oppose Campbellites and Mormons in the matter of baptism with water.

Having now removed the rubbish out of the way, and having swept aside the false glosses with which errorists have obscured the real meaning of the text, we are prepared for its fuller exposition.

In the preceding chapters of this Epistle Paul had clearly and emphatically taught the doctrine of justification by faith without the deeds of the law; and in this sixth chapter he anticipates and answers an obvious objection to the doctrine. "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" (verse 1). As if he had said, Inasmuch as we are saved by grace, through faith, and not by works, shall we say, Then upon that theory we need not perform good works at all, but we should rather continue to sin more and more, because the more sin we commit, the more will God's abundant grace be magnified in our salvation? Having raised and clearly stated the objection to the doctrine he had previously taught, the apostle in verse 2d replies, "God forbid!" and asks the question, "How shall we that are *dead to sin*, live any longer therein?" As much as to say, The same grace which justifies us by faith, without the deeds of the law, also and at the same time kills us to the love and practice of sin, and makes us alive to God and to good works; and therefore we cannot continue in sin, and we have no wish to sin. Thus he shows that the doctrine of free and full justification by grace, through faith, without works, has no tendency to encourage Christians to give a loose rein to licentiousness. He teaches here the same truth which John taught, when he said: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his *seed remaineth in him*; and he *cannot sin*, because he is born of God" (1 John iii. 9). Then, in the third verse, the apostle goes on to show how we become dead to sin, so that we cannot live any longer therein, saying, "Know ye not that so many of us as were *baptized into Jesus Christ* were baptized into his death?" Observe well that he says nothing about any one being baptized into water, or into a "liquid grave," but that he does affirm that we were baptized into *Christ*, and into his *death*. Here we are taught one of the greatest, sublimest, and, at the same time, the most real and precious of all the many mysteries of the gospel—"baptized into Christ" and "into his death." Paul does not say that we are baptized in or into the *name* of Christ. By or with *water* we were baptized in, or into, the *name* of the Lord. But here we are told of a baptism which really and effectually puts us

into Christ himself and into his death, and not merely into his name. What this baptism is the apostle himself tells us in 1 Cor. xii. 13, by saying: "For by one *Spirit* (not by one water) are we all *baptized into one body*," to wit, Christ or Christ's body. The baptism of the Holy Ghost is not a figure or a figurative baptism, as some ignorantly and erroneously affirm, but is a real and most efficient baptism, putting us really and spiritually into Christ, whereby we become wholly identified with him, and altogether one with him in all things pertaining to life and godliness. Our complete, but spiritual, union with and in Christ is plainly taught in many other portions of Scripture. Besides our Lord's parable of the vine and the branches in the fifteenth chapter of John, and Paul's parable of the good olive tree and its branches in the eleventh chapter of Romans, take the following texts as examples: "Now are ye the body of Christ, and members in particular" (1 Cor. xii. 27). "For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones" (Eph. v. 30). On this point we should not overlook our Lord's prayer, with its reach of comprehension and its depth of spiritual significance: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for all them who shall believe on me, through their word; that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be ONE IN US" (John xvii. 20, 21).

No mortal man can explain the manner in which this vital and spiritual union of all Christians with their Lord is accomplished. Our Lord himself tells us that the mode of the Spirit's operations in causing the new birth of the soul, is just as inexplicable and mysterious as is the blowing of the unseen wind. But while we cannot understand how the invisible winds blow, we yet do know that they do blow, and that they sometimes blow with fearful and devastating power. And in like manner, although we cannot tell how the divine Spirit baptizes us into Christ, and into his death, and thus crucifies us to the love and wilful practice of sin, and raises us up new creatures; yet, by experience and observation and the testimony of God, we know that this good work has been most efficiently performed for the salvation of countless millions. In the fourth verse the apostle repeats and enlarges

upon the glorious theme, saying, "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead, by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." As if he had said: As we were baptized by the Holy Ghost into Christ and into his death, it follows that we were in Christ when he died, and died with and in him; and we were in him when he was laid in Joseph's new tomb; and then the old Adam in us was crucified with and in him, and was buried, or laid away, for ever out of life and out of sight; and because of this our union with and in him, when he rose from the dead the third day, we also arose with him, and leaving the old Adam behind buried in the tomb to rise no more, we go forth new creatures to walk in newness of life. The preceding sentence tells what took place potentially, and in the purpose of God, at the time of Christ's crucifixion and resurrection, and what is actualised from time to time in the real experience of Christians. Our whole salvation potentially, and in the divine purpose, was accomplished when Christ died and rose again. But each individual's salvation becomes an experienced and actual fact only at the moment when he believes in the Lord Jesus Christ.

We are now fully prepared to grasp and comprehend the length and depth and breadth and height of the apostle's argument. It is substantially the following: By our baptism into Christ by one Spirit we died to sin in him, and our depraved nature was crucified and buried with him to rise no more, but out of this spiritual death and burial our renewed souls arose with him to new spiritual life, to walk, not in sin, but in newness of life; and therefore we cannot, and we will not, continue in sin. Consequently, the doctrine of full and free justification and salvation, by grace through faith, without the deeds of the law, will not lead to licentiousness; nor will it encourage any Christian to live or continue in sin that grace may abound, because Christians are dead to sin and cannot live any longer therein.

This exposition of the text is confirmed by a consideration of the sixth verse: "Knowing this, that our old man (the old Adam in us) is crucified (put to death) with him, that the body of sin

(our inbred corruption) might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." From this verse we learn *what is dead and buried*. It is lawful to bury the dead, but it is not lawful to bury the living. Paul here tells us that the "old man" is crucified, or put to death. Therefore let the old man be buried out of sight for ever and ever; and the old man, by the baptism of the Holy Ghost at our regeneration, is both crucified and buried for ever and for evermore. We here again see the very wide and irreconcilable variance between the Lord and the immersionists. The Lord buries the dead; but the immersionists bury the living. The Lord crucifies and buries the old Adam; but the immersionists bury the living bodies of flesh.

In the eleventh verse the apostle draws the final conclusion of his whole argument, saying, "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be *dead indeed unto sin*, but alive unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Now, in view of the mighty effects and salutary and lasting fruits of the baptism of which Paul speaks in the text, will any one venture to assert that he had in mind only a burial in water, or in a liquid grave? If any should persist in misinterpreting and perverting this sublime text to the support of dangerous errors, and should continue to eviscerate and destroy this most instructive and comforting passage of God's word by asserting that it teaches a burial in a liquid grave, they must expect some honest lover of God's truth to enter a protest, loud, earnest, and persistent.

GROVES H. CARTLEDGE.