

9/22/30
Budget fund
\$4.00

X
Per
P9284
v. 13

THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

No. 47—JANUARY, 1899.

I. THE PRESBYTERIAN BULWARKS OF LIBERTY AND LAW.

It is a striking and memorable coincidence that while in the City of Philadelphia the Presbyterian Synod of New York and Philadelphia, in 1787, was discussing and amending the report of Witherspoon and his associates, and seeking the best possible embodiment of Presbyterianism as an organized, representative and constitutional government, the Constitutional Convention was also at the same time, in that same city, debating and determining the best form of government for the new Nation. Led by Witherspoon, whose blood still tingled with the thrill of the hour when he signed the Declaration of Independence, the Synod took the Confession of Faith in hand, and without any scrupulosities of reverence for it as a venerable symbol, and in absolute indifference to possibilities of patch-work, stripped it of every vestige of Erastianism, and ordered a thousand copies of the Plan as thus amended, printed for distribution among the Presbyteries, "for their consideration, and the consideration of the churches under their care." In the next Synod, 1788, after further amendment and full discussion, the whole Plan was finally adopted as "The Constitu-

VI. THE BAPTISMAL FORMULA.

The Presbyteries have now under consideration an overture, originating with the Presbytery of East Hanover, submitted to them by the Assembly of 1898. The overture reads as follows: "The Presbytery of East Hanover begs the Assembly to take steps to have the baptismal formula, found in chap. ix., sec. 6, of Directory of Worship, restored to its original form—"I baptize thee in the name," instead of 'into the name,' etc., that this formula may be in harmony with all other parts of our Standards in which the sentence occurs. The Presbytery begs the Assembly to propose to the Presbyteries that they consent to this change." To this request the Assembly consented.

The proposed change has elicited very little discussion. Some few Presbyteries have appointed committees to examine and report at the spring session. So far as known to the writer the overture has been discussed in only three of our religious periodicals, and in these very meagerly. Two of the six correspondents advocated the retention of the present form; a third preferred unto to either in or into; a fourth, the restoration of in; a fifth—a member of East Hanover Presbytery—objected also to the present formula as the work of "sciolists;" and the sixth, whose judgment approved of into, thought it expedient to change back to the old familiar word. As though it were a matter of small importance, the Church seems to have given the matter but little thought. The views of one of the brethren above referred to appeared more fully in the *QUARTERLY* of June, 1894. He then said: "The inspiration for the change from in to into appears to have been drawn from the Revised Version of the New Testament." We think it far more likely that it was due to the growing conviction of scholars that the inspired writers did not use prepositions loosely

and interchangeably; and to the great light thrown upon the subject of baptism by that eminent 'sciolist,' James W. Dale, D. D.

When Dale's first volume, *Classic Baptism*, appeared, the Baptist press denounced him for a 'sciolist.' Said one: "The author of the book shows himself to be an ignoramus." Said another: "It is too late in the day for an upstart with his pedantry," etc. But soon from all quarters of the world where the English language is spoken and from editors, professors and eminent scholars of all denominations, save immersionists, praises and thanks came pouring in. By the adoption of Dale's views in the change of 'formula to into, the little Southern Church put itself in the very front rank. To retreat now is to renounce the advantage of a wealth of learning which elucidates the meaning and spirituality of real baptism. In giving up the Scriptural formula we surrender the key that unlocks many hard texts, and the sword which has won many victories.

The attention of the reader is invited, first, to a collation of all the passages in which the word baptize is followed by a preposition and the word 'name.' To this list we add all other passages in which 'baptize' is followed by the preposition—*εἰς*. It is followed also by the preposition—*ἐν*, but this always indicates the agency by which the baptism is effected—with water, with the Spirit, with fire, by the cloud and by the sea. The synopsis gives the Greek preposition with the renderings of the Authorized and Revised Versions.

It is not pertinent to this inquiry to examine the usage of *ἐν* and *εἰς* with other verbs. We know that the primary meaning of *εἰς* is into; but we know also that after verbs of motion, unless the *εἰς* be reduplicated with the verb, that to is the equivalent of *εἰς*. An illustration of this we have in John 20:4, 6. John outran Peter and *ἦλθε πρῶτος εἰς* the sepulchre, yet went he not in; Simon Peter following *εἰςἦλθεν* the sepulchre. The versions are correct. John

went not in though he came first to the tomb, but Peter went into it.

The following table gives a complete list of all the passages concerned:

Text.	Greek.	A.Ver.	R.Ver.	Complement.
Acts 10:48..	ἐν	.. in	.. in	..Name of the Lord.
Acts 2:38...	ἐπι	.. “	.. “	..Name of Jesus Christ.
Mat. 28:19..	εἰς	.. “	.. into	..Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.
Acts 8:16..	“	.. “	.. “	..Name of the Lord Jesus.
Acts 19:5..	“	.. “	.. “	..Name of the Lord Jesus.
I Cor. 1:13..	“	.. “	.. “	.. Name of Paul.
I Cor. 1:15..	“	.. “	.. “	.. Name, mine own.
Rom. 6:3...	“	.. into	.. “	..Jesus Christ.
Rom. 6:3...	“	.. “	.. “	..His death.
Rom. :4....	“	.. “	.. “	..Death.
I Cor. 12:13.	“	.. “	.. “	..One body.
Gal. 3:27...	“	.. “	.. “	..Christ.
Acts 19:3 ..	“	..unto..	“	..What?
Acts 19:3 ..	“	.. “	.. “	..John's baptism.
Mat. 3:11..	“	.. “	..unto..	..Repentance.
Mark 1:4...	“	.. for	.. “	..Remissions of sins.
Luke 2:3...	“	.. “	.. “	..Remission of sins.
I Cor. 10:2..	“	..unto..	“	..Moses.

Observe that in every citation except the first two the Greek preposition is εἰς; and that εἰς is rendered by the Revisors by into and unto—never once by in. A glance at the table shows this. The rendering in the case of Acts 10:48 is correct. The preposition is not εἰς but ἐν—ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, and means “by the authority.” It was necessary that Peter have express authority for so unwonted a step as the baptism of Gentiles as such. That authority was given him in vision on the tanner's roof. He is solicitous that his brethren should clearly understand that it was at the bidding of the Lord that he granted baptism to Cornelius. And so he did not command them to be bap-

tized εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, into the name of the Lord, but he commanded them, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι—in the name of the Lord, to be baptized.

There is a wide difference between εἰς τὸ ὄνομα and ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι. Says Dale in *Christic Baptism*, page 449, "The prevalent translation of εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, 'in the name,' and its common understanding, 'by the authority of,' has scarcely an advocate among scholars." And again, on page 407, "It is a mistake to suppose that the Greek εἰς τὸ ὄνομα corresponds with the English 'in the name.' The Greek form ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι corresponds both in form and in force with the English phrase. These two Greek forms are not equivalent and must not be confounded. When Peter commanded the lame man 'in the name (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι) of Jesus Christ to rise up and walk,' the Greek phrase and the English are in entire correspondence. So when Peter (Acts 10:48) commanded Cornelius and friends 'in the name (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι) of the Lord, to be baptized, there is the same correspondence; 'in the name' being dependent on 'command,' and not on 'baptize.' The phrases baptize εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, 'into the name,' expressing the ideal element into which the baptized object passes and baptize ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, 'in the name,' declaring the authority by which the baptism is administered, are fundamentally diverse in conception and must be so exhibited in the translation. Again: "Εἰς τὸ ὄνομα and ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι are never substituted in sacred or classic literature, as synonyms." Such being the inherent difference between these two forms, we have seen there was abundant reason why Peter should command baptism by special authority. "There was no occasion in all Peter's ministry when he more needed to be invested with divine authority, than when the door of the Christian Church was to be opened to the Gentile world."

The only objection which can be urged against this interpretation is the order of the words. To this Dale replies: "The order of sequence does not necessarily de-

termine the grammatical or logical order." This he illustrates by reference to Scriptures. He continues: "It may be further answered: Cyril of Jerusalem quotes this passage giving another order, thus: 'Peter commanded them (*ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι* I. X. *βαπτισθῆναι*) in the name of Jesus Christ to be baptized. It is highly probable that this was the order and the phraseology of the text used by Cyril, as it is also that of the Codex Sinaiticus. Objection from the order is therefore not only annulled, but whatever of weight belongs to it is thrown heavily on the other side."—*Christian Baptism*, p. 205.

Stier, also, says: "'Εἰς τὸ ὄνομα cannot simply be equivalent to *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι* which only occurs in Acts 10:48, where *ἐν* is for *εἰς*, or teaches that these Gentiles were baptized in the full and plenary authority and will of Christ."

This first, then, on our list, should be stricken out, being not dependent on the verb—baptize.

And what shall be said of the second and only remaining exception: Acts 2:38? The proposition here is neither *εἰς* nor *ἐν*, but *ἐπι*. The argument of one of the brethren referred to at the beginning of this article as advocating a change is curious. "As by no possibility can *ἐπι τῷ ὀνόματι* be translated into the name, neither should *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* be so rendered." By no possibility can *εἰς* be permitted its primary meaning, because, forsooth, *ἐπι* has not that meaning! Neither can *ἐπι* by any possibility be rendered in. The translators have ample authority for rendering *εἰς* by into, but none whatever for rendering *ἐπι τῷ ὀνόματι*, in the name. Prof. Harrison (*Greek Prepositions*) gives 'on,' 'upon' as the primary meaning of *ἐπι*, with six figurative meanings growing out of it.

Here, let me observe, that some may shrink from the formula, 'baptize into Christ,' because it seems to afford some countenance to the theory of immersion. But the fear is needless for there is not a single instance in the Bible of baptism (*εἰς*) into water. What shall we say of Mark

1:9: Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee and was baptized of John in (*εἰς*) Jordan. It may seem to some that our list of instances wherein 'baptize' is followed by the preposition *εἰς* is incomplete through the omission of this text. But here as in Acts 10:48 *εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην* is not dependent on the verb 'baptize,' but on the verb *ἦλθεν*, thus: Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee to the Jordan and was baptized by John. *Εἰς* after the verb of motion, means to, just as it did in the case of John who came first to (*εἰς*) the sepulchre but went not in. And as in the case of Acts 10:48 verbal juxtaposition does not determine grammatical and logical order. Jesus came to the Jordan and was baptized by John.

To return to Acts 2-38. To baptize on the name of Jesus, is indeed a most singular expression. Nowhere else does it occur. To believe on the name of Jesus is not uncommon. Dale supposes an ellipsis of a participle—'believing,' and translates: Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, (believing) upon the name of Jesus Christ, into (*εἰς*) the remission of sins. This is plausible, very; but there is another consideration which, we think, converts plausibility into assurance. A glance at the table of texts calls attention to the fact that while the R. V. almost uniformly translates *εἰς* by into, in four instances it is rendered unto. We are reminded of John who preached that repentance baptized into a state of pardon—the baptism of repentance *εἰς* the remission of sins. The abandonment of into in these passages for unto, and the 'for' of the A. V. squint at baptismal regeneration. Indeed, the Campbellites, notably, and others use them to prove that water baptism effects regeneration. John, however, taught that repentance baptized into the remission of sins. Of this baptism Paul said (Acts 19:4): 'John verily baptized with' (there is no 'with' in the Greek) 'the baptism of repentance' (i. e., symbolized it with water) 'saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come

after him; that is, on Christ Jesus." What more natural and proper, then, that the first distinctively Christian preaching should conjoin these two—repentance into remission and faith on Jesus who had finished his work. Repent and be baptized, every one of you (believing) on the name of Jesus Christ, into the remission of sins. Believing on Jesus, repentance still baptizes into pardon. This is the evangelical doctrine; water baptism in the name of Jesus for or into remission, is not.

The passage as it stands in the list above should then be stricken off, but replaced thus: Acts 2:38 *ei's* A. V. for R. V. into remission of sins. The result is that we have seventeen instances in which the word baptize is followed by *ei's* invariably, and the ideal element into which one is baptized. Why should not into be the invariable English equivalent. Again I quote Dale: "The essential of any baptism is made known in the clearest and most exhaustive manner when the receptive element (that into which the baptized object really or verbally passes) is declared. Thus when I am told that a living man is baptized into water, I know he is put in a condition which . . . issues of necessity in the destruction of life by suffocation. If the baptism is into fire, I know, by like reasoning, that the issue is the destruction of life by burning. So, if into insensibility, the issue declared is a condition of complete unconsciousness; or, if into impurity, a condition of complete pollution. There is neither change of principle nor obscurity of thought induced by a person being introduced as the receptive element. Who would stumble at the statement, 'I have dipped into Aristotle,' or . . . 'he is imbued with Plato,' or 'immersed in Shakspeare.' As the names of Aristotle, Plato, and Shakspeare are so intimately associated with certain distinctive conceptions that the names alone are suggestive and representative of them, so the name of the Lord Jesus is indissolubly and solely connected with the sacrificial atonement for sin, and it is, there-

fore, a difference in form and not in thought when sinners are said to be baptized 'into the remission of sins,' or 'into the name of the Lord Jesus,' from whom the remission of sins alone proceeds." The Scriptures give us no definition of baptism except by the word or words which are complementary of the idea of the verb. Abandon into and no one knows what baptism is.

The correspondent who disapproves both in and into, and advocates unto, remarks: "That Baptists should insist that nothing will do but 'baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' is not singular but why Presbyterians should clamor for it is not so readily understood." He is just as much opposed to into. He writes: "The R. V. uniformly substitutes 'into the name' except in one notable case ('No. 4'), where they could not face the music; which plainly reveals the fact that 'into the name' is as faulty and inadequate as 'in the name.' But what do the advocates of 'into' mean? What idea do they wish to express, or what hidden sense do they wish to insinuate, by the phrase, 'baptize into the name of the Lord Jesus,' or 'into the name of Paul,' or 'baptized into Christ?' One naturally suspects some latent mystical sense in the words, or some mysterious communication of sacramental grace."

"One naturally suspects some latent mystical sense in the words." Most assuredly there is a mystical sense, not latent but palpable, in the words. Baptism into Christ, or into the name of Christ, which is the same thing, denotes that which our theologians recognize as the "mystic union." It is no more difficult of comprehension than the language of our Catechism, which defines baptism as an "engrafting into Christ." "In Christ" is a pivotal phrase which is very dear to the Christian, for to be in Christ is to be a Christian. Paul refers to his 'brethren which were in Christ before him. If one be in Christ he is a new creature—and not otherwise. He is made the righteousness of God in Christ.

He is a saint, because sanctified in Christ. He is complete in Christ. By nature we are not in Christ, but in Adam. By some means we must be put into Christ. If not we are unsaved. It seems to us a strange question: "What do the advocates of 'into' mean? What do they mean to express?" By some means we who are not in Christ must be put into Christ, and the Scriptures say that only baptism does it. It is not "hard to explain satisfactorily what baptism into Christ means in English." Union and fellowship with Christ by baptism into Christ is a fundamental Biblical truth. "My Latinity is not first-class, but I strongly suspect," continues the writer, "that Paul himself, with all his scholarship and inspiration, when preaching in Rome, could not have said the thing in Latin." Apropos to this, suffer a quotation from Prof. Schaff (*Revision of New Testament*, p. xxxi.)—"Matt. 28:19, 'baptizing in the name,' is an error of translation. . . . This error arises from the translation of the Vulgate 'in nomine.' Tertullian had it correctly, 'in nomen.'

"Or, one naturally suspects," said this correspondent, "some mysterious communication of sacramental grace." Another also speaks of baptism into Christ—into the family of God—as a vicious formula. "Is it not dangerous?" he exclaimed. "Is not this the *opus operatum*? It certainly teaches baptismal regeneration." Does it? The Confession of Faith, Ch. 27, Sec. 2, reads thus: "There is in every sacrament a spiritual relation or sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified; whence it comes to pass that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other."

A question is pertinent just here. Is water baptism the sign or the thing signified? Is it real baptism or a symbol? If a symbol, it symbolizes something; and being divinely appointed, that something must be the truth. It symbolizes regeneration or real baptism with the Spirit whereby we are baptized into Christ. Being in Christ the soul is

purified, and water, a detergent, is aptly appointed to symbolize cleansing from sin. To say that the rite of baptism symbolizes regeneration, and to say that it communicates sacramental grace, are two very different things. As a symbol it must symbolize something and that something is regeneration with the spirit, baptism into Christ, consequent purification in him.

On the other hand, if the rite symbolize nothing and is itself the only baptism, what does baptism into or for the remission of sins mean? The baptism is completed with the action—whether that be immersion in water or sprinkling with water. For and unto can mean only that the intent or effect of this completed action is the remission of sins. These prepositions teach baptismal regeneration. But baptism into Christ, into remission of sins, into Christ's death, are not baptisms at all until the subject is really in Christ, in a state of pardon, in partnership with Christ in his death. Oneness with Christ is baptism, and not the result of baptism. The nature of the baptism is determined by the words complementary to βαπτίζω εἰς. Water cannot baptize into Christ, but it can and does symbolize real baptism with the Spirit. What is real baptism? Baptism into Christ—union with him and consequent fellowship in all that he achieved as Saviour. The baptism of the New Testament is not for or unto remission; it is remission because it is into Christ. Strike out into, and baptism is robbed of Scriptural definition. There remains nothing for us to choose between save the Baptist rite of immersion in water and the Scriptural rite of baptism with water. And, when the water rite is administered, are we not teaching the *'opus operatum'* when we say that it—the finished ordinance—is unto Christ's death—unto remission? On the other hand, the putting into Christ is baptism, of which the rite is only a symbol. Furthermore, baptism by Jesus with the Spirit is wholly ignored. As to the phrases, baptism in the Spirit, in his death, in Christ, in remission, they are obviously mean-

ingless. Baptism 'in the name' can mean nothing but 'by the authority of' and can refer only to the water rite; but 'in the name' is certainly an incorrect rendering of *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*. Any English preposition but into blots from the Bible the fundamental doctrine of Spiritual baptism. *Εἰς* it always is in the Greek; into it always should be in the English.

The defender of unto as the invariable rendering of *εἰς* after 'baptize' asks: "Why did not the R. V. put it 'baptized into Moses?'" We would indeed like very much to know. Our brother overlooked the fact that the R. V. made this mistake not once only, but four times. His answer is not satisfactory to us. He says, "For once, the form of the passage, as well as the idea, shut them up to the simple, natural and everywhere translatable idea and both of them put it, as it would have been well to put it everywhere else that *εἰς* occurs in such connection, 'baptized unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea.'"

"The simple, natural and everywhere translatable idea"—'baptism unto remission' we have already considered as teaching the unscriptural idea of pardon by rite, or baptismal regeneration. We object also, to the rendering, 'in the cloud and in the sea.' The Israelites were not in either. The preposition is the same used by John who baptized with water. Sometimes John's baptism with water is expressed by the instrumental dative without a preposition, thus confirming authoritatively the rendering that water is not the receptive element but the agency, by which the baptism was effected. And so here, the Israelites were baptized with or by the sea and cloud—into Moses.

This passage—I Cor. 10.2—is thus commented upon by Hodge: "Baptized unto Moses, i. e., in reference to Moses, so as by baptism to be made his disciples." Baptism *εἰς*—into—Christ means something far more than being made his disciple. "Unto Christ," regards baptism as a completed work resulting in Christian Discipleship; "into

Christ," does not mark the effect of baptism but is definitive of the baptism.

In Acts 19:3, Paul does not ask "unto what," but "into what were ye baptized?" It is essential (not to the symbolic rite, but to real baptism) that it be into somewhat. The reply was into—John's baptism effected by repentance into remission and symbolized with water. Had these disciples believed that baptism *ei's* meant baptism in, and had they as immersionists been taught that the only baptism was in water, they would have been astonished that an Apostle could ask such question. With surprise they would have explained: "Into what? Why, into water, of course!"

Before returning to consider "baptism into Moses" let us apply the prepositions 'unto' and 'in' to the case of Paul, I Cor. 1:13, 15. Here again Hodge renders *ei's* by "unto," i. e., in reference to Paul. . . . "By baptism we are brought into the number of the disciples and followers of his unto" (!) "whose name, or in reference to whom we are baptized." Paul thanks God that he had baptized only a few in Corinth, "as thus all pretext that he was making disciples to himself was taken away."

It is obvious that the two questions of verse 13 are by this interpretation rendered utterly incongruous and meaningless, thus: Was Paul crucified for you? Were ye by baptism made my followers? Some of the Corinthian church were of Paul—followers of his; and some, who mistakenly identified Peter with the Judaizers, were of Cephas. But Paul is far from intimating that the phrase—baptise *ei's* himself—meant to make a disciple to himself; and *ei's* *Χριστόν*—to make a disciple to Christ. He assumes it as well known that baptism into a person is the establishment of such union with that person as ensures partnership with him in all the benefits he has to share. And so he condemned their factions. Christ he says is not divided, and therefore they should not be divided. All are one in him.

Except as a helper of their faith in Jesus, Paul could profit them nothing. Was Paul crucified for them? Their baptism was not into Paul. He could not share with them the benefits of an atoning sacrifice. They were baptized into Christ and into his death.

Baptism, then, into Christ is not mere discipleship to Christ effected by the water rite, but fellowship with him in all the glorious award of his obedience unto death.

A legitimate inference from verse 15: "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but, etc.—lest any should say that I baptized into mine own name"—is, that the ritual baptism with water symbolizes this vital union with the person into whom one is baptised. The very formula—"into Christ"—should be used which teaches the nature of real baptism. This usage is Scriptural and Confessional.

Before leaving this, it may be remarked that the rendering, in the name, i. e. by the authority of, is equally impossible. Paul had apostolic authority, and in the exercise of that authority he *did* baptize Crispus and Gaius and the household of Stephanas.

We return now to baptism into Moses. This differs from baptism into Christ, just as the servant differs from Christ the Lord. Completeness of influence is in both cases indicated by the verb and preposition. Says Dale: "In the phrases baptized into sleep, into insensibility, into repentance, into remission of sins, into Moses, into Paul, into Christ, 'baptized into' is common to them all, and has precisely the same force in all. The differentials are sleep, insensibility, repentance, remission of sin, Moses, Paul and Christ."

The Israelites, by the cloud and by the sea, as not by all the plagues, were at last delivered from Egyptian bondage, and brought into fellowship with Moses in all the benefits which his commission designed for the children of Israel. The meaning is easily comprehended if once we know what is meant by baptism into Christ.

The change from into to in we must regard as most deplorable. To recapitulate:

1. The Greek preposition is invariably *εἰς*.
2. The Revised Version never renders it by in after "baptize."
3. *Εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* never in classic nor Hellenistic Greek means 'in the name,' i. e. by authority of.
4. 'Baptism into Christ' and 'into the name of Christ' are one and the same thing. As a writer in the last QUARTERLY expresses this universally admitted fact: "The name of Christ stands for Christ. To believe on the name of the Son is to believe on the Son. To call on the name of the Lord is to call on the Lord." But baptism in Christ is meaningless and therefore 'baptism in the name of Christ,' being its exact equivalent, is meaningless.
5. The Authorized Version's "for remission," and the Revised Version's "unto remission," squint at baptismal regeneration, and are used as proof texts by the Campbellites.
6. Abandon into and we rob the Bible of its own interpretation of baptism, and render any interpretation conjectural.
7. Not only so, but we erase from its pages all reference to real baptism, leaving only the water rite.
8. If it be said that we still have left us 'baptism with the Spirit,' my answer is: Yes, this is true, but we have no means of knowing what it is if it be not into Christ. The country is full of enthusiasts and errorists who tell us of power, fire, holiness, etc., but baptism into Christ seems utterly forgotten. The abandonment of the Scriptural formula will tend still further to obscure the truth.
9. Only into affords a rational and Scriptural sense in all the seventeen instances. Real baptism is always into Christ, into the Trinity, into repentance, into remission, into Christ's death, into one body. There was a baptism into

Moses, a typical Saviour from a typical bondage ; there could be no baptism into Paul as Saviour.

Unto. In no case does "unto" avail itself of the complement to define baptism. In every case baptism is the rite. Its significance is not uniform. In some instances, baptism unto, i. e., in reference to, may mean that baptism is a means of avowing discipleship. Baptism unto remission is heterodox. Baptism unto repentance, however, is disavowed by Campbellites even. Baptism unto death, and unto Christ's death, and unto one body are meaningless.

In. Baptism "in" the name is a mistranslation. Baptism in repentance, in Christ, in one body, in death, are inane and unintelligible expressions. In what were ye baptized is ludicrous. The same general remark is true of "in"—that it does not help define the baptism, and leaves nothing but water baptism to be defined. Should Paul appeal to us: Know ye not that so many as were baptized in Christ were baptized in his death, we should have to plead ignorance.

We cannot concur with the esteemed brother who wrote: "As the formula needs explanation in either case, it were best to change it back to the old familiar word." On the contrary, it were better to let it stay as it is, since when properly explained, it elucidates the truth, than to change to the old familiar word, which, however explained, can only obscure the truth.

JOHN W. PRIMROSE.

Greenville, Miss.