

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

4-12-1935

### The Doctrine of Baptism in the Epistles of St. Paul

Clarence W. Stradtman

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir\_jagelsr@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Stradtman, Clarence W., "The Doctrine of Baptism in the Epistles of St. Paul" (1935). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 940.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/940>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM BY IMMERSION

When discussing the doctrine of baptism in our subsequent writing we must first determine the point to which an important part of our study should finally be brought. It is good to argue unless we have a sound scriptural basis; so let us investigate the use of this word.

**THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM**

**in the**

**EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL**

In the New Testament the word baptizo and its derivatives about 13 times, in the largest majority of these cases it is used as the technical term for the Sacrament of Baptism, as we shall see here, but we base our deductions upon the others.

**(B. D. Thesis)**

Let us first look at Mark 7:1-8. There we read as follows, "And when they had washed their hands with water, they found that they were defiled with defiled hands, they found that they were defiled with defiled hands, they found that they were defiled with defiled hands, except they wash their hands, they eat and drink, holding the traditions of the fathers. And why do they leave the market except they wash their hands, they eat and drink, and any other things there be which they have received to hold, as the washing of cups and plates, stoves and of tables."

**Read by**

**Dr. P. E. Kretzmann**

**Dr. J. T. Mueller**

**Submitted by**

**Clarence W. Stradtman**

**Concordia Seminary  
St. Louis, Missouri**

**April 12, 1935**

## THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM IN THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL.

When discussing the doctrine of baptism in any New Testament writing we must first come to an agreement on the one point on which an important part of the argument hinges, namely, the exact meaning of the word βαπτίζω. It will do little good to argue unless we have a common ground in this matter; so let us investigate the use of this word.

In the New Testament we find the word βαπτίζω or its derivatives about 122 times. However, in by far the largest majority of these cases it is used as the terminus technicus for the Sacrament of Baptism, so we cannot argue from those, but we base our deductions upon the others.

Let us first look at Mark 7, 2-5. There we read as follows, "And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled (κοινῶν) hands, that is to say unwashed (ἀνεπίπλους) hands, they found fault, for the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash (λύουσιν) their hands oft, eat not, holding the traditions of the fathers. And when they come from the market except they wash (ὑδατίουσιν), they eat not, and many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the washing (βαπτισμῶν) of cups and pots, brazen vessels and of tables (κλίνων beds)." From the usage of the word in verse five where the writer speaks of "baptising" even beds, we conclude that the word means to cleanse, to wash with water. Dr. Carson does not know what to do with this passage. He says, "There is nothing like an absurdity in the supposition that the couches were immersed. The thing is quite pos-

sible, and who will say that the superstitious Pharisees might not practice it? It would be a very inconvenient thing, but what obstacles will not superstition overcome?" (Carson: Baptism in its mode and Subjects, p. 71). Indeed what obstacles will not superstition overcome! The idea of Immersing is entirely foreign to the text. Then again if we notice that <sup>βαπτίζω</sup> βαπτίζω, and <sup>ῥαντίζω</sup> ῥαντίζω are used interchangeably in the same passages, we conclude that these words must have had the same meaning as far as those Jews were concerned. To get a still clearer picture of this let us put Mark 7, 2.3 and Luke 11, 38 side by side. The writers are speaking of exactly the same thing, namely washing before eating, and yet the one uses <sup>ῥαντίζω</sup> ῥαντίζω and the other uses βαπτίζω, hence these two words must be synonyms, and it is commonly accepted that ῥαντίζω does not mean to immerse.

The "Washing of regeneration" of Titus 5, 3 and the "Washing of the water by the Word" are commonly referred to baptism, but if we look at these passages we find not the word βαπτίζω but <sup>λούω</sup> λούω, hence λούω and βαπτίζω must also be synonyms. Thayer gives λούω as a synonym of ῥαντίζω, and we have seen that ῥαντίζω and βαπτίζω are used interchangeably, so that would give the same meaning to all three words.

In Matt. 3, 11 Christ promises his disciples a baptism "with the Holy Ghost and with fire". The fulfillment of this promise is found in Acts 2, 2-4, but there is nothing said of an immersion in fire. We read, "And there appeared unto them cloven tongues as of fire, and sat upon each of them." This is called a baptism by Jesus himself, yet it is no immersion.

In Heb. 9, 10 the word *βαπτισμὸς* is used of many ceremonial washings of the Old Testament. It is claimed that many of these washings were immersions. We can grant that, but they were not all such. Numbers 19 verse 13 reads, "Whosoever toucheth the dead body of a man that is dead, and purifieth not himself, defileth the tabernacle of the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off from Israel, because the water of separation was not sprinkled (*סָרַף*) upon him, he shall be unclean." In this verse as well as in verse 18 and 19 sprinkling is mentioned as a means of purification, one of the divers washings.

In the LXX the word *βαπτισμὸς* is used twelve times as a translation of the word *סָרַף*. We cannot discuss all of these but just a few of them will be sufficient. Leviticus 14, 6 and 14, 51 give the laws governing the cleansing of a leper. The leper must bring two birds (sparrows, according to the Hebrew). The one bird shall be killed by the priest, "in an earthen vessel over running water." Then we read verses 6 and 51, "As for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop and shall dip (*βαπτισμὸς, סָרַף*) them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed over the running water." I think everyone will grant that it would be impossible to immerse all of that in the blood of one sparrow.

That is the usage of the word in the Bible, the New Testament as well as the LXX translation. Now let us take just one example from the Apocrypha and one from the early church writings. In the apocryphal book of Judith, chapter 13, 7 we are told that Judith remained in the camp of Holofernes army

three days "and went out in the night into the valley Bethulia and washed (ἐβαπτίζετο) in the camp in the fountain of water." It is very improbable that there would be a spring within the camp that would be large enough for Judith to immerse herself, or if there was, it is improbable that an honorable Jewish girl would do that in the midst of a camp of heathen soldiers. We can grant the possibility of all of that, and yet this passage cannot mean that Judith immersed herself because we read, "καὶ ἐβαπτίζετο ἐν τῇ πηλῶν ἁλῶν ἐν τῇ τῆς πηλῆς τοῦ ὕδατος . She washed herself upon (ἐπὶ) the fountain. Even by a stretch of interpretation this cannot mean immersion.

Now we go to the Church Fathers and find that they did not consider immersion an essential part of baptism. We quote the Didache, the Teaching of the Twelve, Chapter VII, "Having first rehearsed all these things, baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy ghost in living water, but if you do not have living water baptize in other water, if you are not able in cold then in warm, but if you do not have either, pour out water upon the head three times (ἐκχέου εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῖς ὕδατος) in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." Nothing whatever is said of immersion. It simply states that water should be poured upon the head.

Finally we go to the writers of classical Greek. Here we will simply quote several sentences from the classics to show that they also used the word βαπτίζειν in such instances where it cannot mean immersion.

Homer: De Vita et Poesi: "The lake was baptised in blood."

Plutarch: Vita Marcelli: "Hauling up the prow until they were erect on the stern they baptised (the ships)."

Plutarch: Vita Alexandri: "The soldiers along the way baptised with cups, horns, and goblets--were drinking one to the other.

Dio Cassius: Dionis Cassii Hist. Rom.: "And the other (enemy) from above baptised (pelting) them with stones".

In the above quotations (taken from Gerfen, Baptizein and Eucharist) it is clear that the classical writers did not always understand *βαπτίζειν* to mean immerse.

We grant that *βαπτίζειν* can mean to immerse, and that in many cases it perhaps does, but when we take the above instances into consideration we must come to the conclusion that the word *βαπτίζειν* does not necessarily imply immersion.

With this basis for the meaning of one of the chief words in matters concerning the sacred rite of baptism, we can begin with an investigation of the Doctrine of Baptism in the Pauline Epistles.

I. THE NATURE OF BAPTISM.

First we must look into the nature of baptism as taught by Paul. Is our Lutheran definition of a Sacrament, which requires that it have a divine command, a visible element, and a divine promise in agreement with the apostle's doctrine? This is the definition that Baier gives in his Compendium (III, 404), "Requiritur a vero ad sacramentum proprie et stricte sic dictum, 1. ut sit actio a Deo mandata; 2. ut

habeat elementum visibile divinitus praescriptum; 3. ut habeat promissionem gratiae evangelicae."

The Divine Command:

Let us then look at the first point. Can we find any passage in the Epistles of Paul where baptism is strictly commanded? That we cannot, and yet we can say on the basis of these Epistles that baptism is divinely commanded. The command to baptise is taken for granted as we will recognize from such passages as Gal. 3, 27 and Eph. 5, 26. The first passage, Gal. 3, 27: "For as many of you as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ." Certainly if Paul speaks of baptism into Christ it must be done according to the will of Christ and with His <sup>sanction.</sup> The second passage, Eph. 5, 25, 26: "As Christ also loved the Church and gave himself for it. That He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word," does not seem to refer to this point at all, but if we examine it more closely we see that baptism is here spoken of as being based on the divine will. Baptism as a sacrament rests upon the vicarious satisfaction of Christ as we learn in this passage. Since that is the case, it must be based on the Name of Christ, or on Christ himself, and thus also on His will. And in baptism it must not be forgotten that a confession of the name of Christ (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ) is the same as a confession of the Holy Trinity, as we see from Phil. 2, 10, 11: "That at the name of Jesus (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ) every knee should bow of things in heaven and things in earth and things under the earth and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." This also

Baptism is not absolutely necessary. Dr. Packer expresses



- 7 -

follows from 1 Cor. 12, 3: "And that no man can say that Jesus is Lord, but by the Holy Ghost."

These two passages will suffice to show that Paul recognized it as the will of God that Christians should be baptized. Baptism is commanded by God, but is it absolutely necessary to salvation? The Catholic Church teaches that it is; (Catechismus Romanus, II. 3. Quest. XXV) "Sed cum caeterarum rerum cognitio quae hactenus expositum sunt fidelibus utilissima habenda sit; tum vero nihil magis necessarium videri potest quam ut doceantur omnibus dominibus Baptismi legem a Domino praescriptum esse, ita ut nisi per Baptismi gratiam Deo renascantur in sempiternam miseriam et interitum a parentibus, sive illi fidelis sint, procreentur." Hodge accuses us Lutherans of teaching the same thing. (Outlines, p. 502): "What is the Romish and Lutheran doctrine as to the necessity of baptism? They hold that the benefits conveyed by baptism are ordinarily conveyed in no other way, and consequently, baptism is absolutely necessary to salvation, both for infants and adults." What does Paul say on this point? If we look only at Titus 3, 5 it would seem as though he considered it necessary for salvation, for he says, "According to His mercy He saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." He saved us by "the washing of regeneration", that is by baptism. However, now if we place parallel with that Rom. 1, 16 and Rom. 3, 28 we see that the Gospel is the power of God to salvation and that we are justified by faith. What are we to conclude from that? The only possible conclusion is that since the same grace is offered to us in the Gospel, baptism is not absolutely necessary. Dr. Pieper expresses

this clearly (Christliche Dogmatik, III, 329): "Alle Gnadenmittel haben denselben Zweck und dieselbe Wirkung naemlich die Darbietung der Vergebung der Suenden und die dadurch bewirkte Erzeugung und Staerkung des Glaubens. 'Es steht nicht so, dass die Vergebung der Suenden zum ersten Drittel durch das Wort des Evangeliums, zum zweiten Drittel durch die Taufe und zum dritten Drittel durch das Abendmahl kaeme', sondern, 'die Schrift schreibt ohne alle Limitation sowohl dem Wort des Evangeliums als auch der Taufe wie auch dem Abendmahl die Vergebung der Suenden zu'. Wer daher zum Glauben an das Evangelium gekommen ist, der hat Vergebung der Suenden und die Seligkeit, wenn es bei ihm durch irgendwelche Umstaende auch nicht zur Taufe kam."

Here we must also consider Col. 2, 12, where St. Paul states that baptism took the place of the Old Testament sacrament of circumcision. Circumcision was a means of grace in the Old Testament, but it was a sacrament, a Means of Grace in which only the male infants could take part. However, we know that also female infants were saved in the Old Testament. Though the way may be unknown to us, God had a way by which He saved them. He saved them without circumcision. Baptism is the New Testament sacrament which took the place of circumcision. Hence, we conclude that in the New Testament God can save souls also without the sacrament of baptism.

We have seen that baptism is not absolutely necessary, and now as usual, there are extremists on the other side, too, who say, If it is not absolutely necessary, why use it at all? They propose this argument. If adults are truly regenerate

However, there is still one passage that we must study in this connection, namely, 1 Cor. 1, 14-17. Holtmann is at

and have received the gift of faith before being baptised, they do not have need of the Sacrament of Baptism and therefore it may be disregarded in their case. To this we must answer that even if adults are truly converted before baptism and have received the true gift of faith and therefore do not need baptism for that purpose, those adults are still in need of baptism because of the command of Christ, who has prescribed this way of obtaining salvation, namely, that they be baptised in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost even after the Word has completed its work of conversion, and also because of the necessity of renewing those who are regenerated; for it is a bath for that purpose according to Titus 3, 5: "According to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Hunnius has very aptly expressed this (De Bapt. Contra Donat., B. 5, Cap. 25, quoted in L.W. 6, 298): "Die Taufe zwar kann da sein wo die Bekehrung des Herzens fehlt; aber die Bekehrung des Herzens (welche hauptsächlich in Anzuendung des Glaubens besteht) kann zwar da sein, ohne dass man die Taufe empfangen hat, aber nicht wenn man sie verachtet hat. Denn das ist durchaus keine Bekehrung zu Gott zu nennen, wenn das Sakrament Gottes verachtet wird." Augustine expresses it very simply and clearly, "Contemptus sacramenti damnat, non privatio."

Baptism then is not to be considered absolutely necessary to salvation, but neither are we to look upon it as superfluous, for it is a ~~Means of Grace that God has given us for~~ salvation.

However, there is still one passage that we must study in this connection, namely, 1 Cor. 1, 14-17. Holtzmann is at

- 10 -

the head of a group of modern theologians who look upon this passage as a proof that baptism is not divinely instituted or at least that it shows that baptism is not to be looked upon as a very important matter. Paul says, v. 14, "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius." Immediately this is looked upon as evidence that Paul himself neglected to baptise, but if we read just one verse more we find Paul's reason for saying this. "Lest any should say that I had baptised in mine own name." There were factions or groups in Corinth as we find in v. 12. Some said, "I am of Paul," others "I am of Peter," etc. And now in order not to give further strength and encouragement to this factionism, Paul refrained from baptising altogether. Then he goes on to say in v. 17: "For Christ sent me not to baptise but to preach the Gospel." This is one of the passages in which Paul expresses what he considers his duty in the church. If we picture it this way, that to evangelize is to cast out the net, (the true apostolic work) and to baptize is to gather the fish already caught, and put them into the vessel, we will better understand Paul's position. He was the called apostle to the gentiles. He considered it his duty to be a pioneer. He cast the net and then appointed elders and presbyters "to gather the fish and put them into the vessel", which he carried on his pioneer work in some other city. For that reason he can say "For Christ sent me not to baptise but to preach the <sup>g</sup>ospel;" but his words do not argue against the importance of baptism.

Thus we have seen that baptism as taught by Paul does have the first of the three requirements found in our definition of a sacrament, namely, the divine command.

## The Visible Element:

Every true sacrament must have a visible material or element. This element in baptism is water. If we had no other clue to this than just the word *βαπτίζω*, that would be evidence enough, for this word means to wash, sprinkle, pour, or immerse. It is used of every kind of washing including that of the human body and that of dishes and beds. What then is the material used for washing? Certainly not sand, oil, or wine is used. So now we can expect that when the apostles use the word "to wash" *βαπτίζω*, they use it in the ordinary connection. If they had wanted us "to wash" with anything other than water they would have stated it clearly. However, that is not the only evidence that we have with regard to the material to be used in baptism for Paul says clearly, Eph. 5, 26, "with the washing of water by the Word." In this verse the *ὕδατος* is the genitive of material and the article *τοῦ* with *λουτροῦ* marks this as the well known bath of the baptismal water. (Expositor's Greek Testament). Hence we conclude that baptism is to be a baptism in water and whoever disregards that or substitutes a different element does not have a valid baptism even if he does speak the words, "I baptize thee in the name of" etc.

Dr. Walther has in his "Pastorale" a fine quotation from Deyling concerning this. Deyling writes: "Es kommt nichts darauf an, ob das Taufwasser aus einer Quelle oder aus einem Teiche geschöpft, ob es Regen- oder Tauwasser; warmes, kaltes oder laues sei, weil sich hierueber in der Heiligen Schrift keine Bestimmung findet. Genug, wenn man wahres, Sowohl natuerliches als reines Wasser anwendet, welches die reinigende uerliches als reines Wasser anwendet, welches die reinigende

Kraft der Taufe vorzustellen geeignet ist. Welche an die Stelle desselben eine andere Flüssigkeit setzen und z.B. kuenstliches Muskat- oder Rosenwasser anwenden, auf welche Torheit zuweilen die Vornehmen und Reichen aus Hoffart kommen, oder Wein, Milch oder Bier unter dem Vorwande, es sei ein Notfall, gebrauchen wollen, diesen ist zu bedeuten, dass das Sakrament auf diese Weise verfaelscht wird, weil zum Wesen der Taufe wahres Wasser erforderlich ist, das/dieselbe ist ein Wasserbad im Wort, Eph. 5, 26." (Deyling quoted in Lehre und Wehre, Vol. 53, 346).

Thus we conclude that baptism as taught by Paul must have a visible element, and that element must be water.

#### The divine Promise:

Baptism as taught by St. Paul brings with it a divine promise. It is a guarantee of our conversion, which includes sandtification, forgiveness of sins, and eternal life; for in Titus 3, 5 we read, Christ "saved us according to His mercy by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost". (v. 7), "that being justified by His grace we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." Baptism is here represented as a finished act. It has been made. There is nothing to be added. And this salvation is imparted to us through the washing of water as a means of giving and sealing to the believer the great benefits of salvation. This, however, is not only an outward washing, but a washing of the heart, so that through it the heart of man is regenerated, so that he is born anew to spiritual life. This regeneration is a single act, but the effects of it continue throughout life. It is

renewed from day to day. 2 Cor. 4, 16, "The inward man is renewed day by day." So the simple water of baptism is endowed by God with power so that it becomes the bearer of salvation of God to the heart of man. Regeneration and conversion are synonyms, for in working in us the new spiritual birth God turns or converts us, forgiving all of our sins and imputing to us the full righteousness of Jesus Christ. We are justified before God, not only with reference to sin but also with regard to the punishment and guilt of sin, by receiving His grace through faith which is wrought in us in baptism.

In Eph. 5, 25, 26 this same promise is expressed. "...as Christ loved the church and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." The church is to be sanctified, it is to be cleansed by the washing of water, by baptism. "Christ consecrated His Church and set it apart for himself. This He did by cleansing each member of the church by the miraculous washing of water, by the sacrament of Holy Baptism. The water of baptism cleanses from the corruption of inherited sin. It has the power to regenerate, to renew heart and mind, to renew the entire nature or man." (Kretzmann, Pop. Comm.).

(Note: These two passages will suffice here to show that baptism has a divine promise connected with it. There are other passages, but they will be taken up under the next part).

We have now seen that baptism as taught by Paul in his epistles does measure up to the requirements set by our Lutheran definition of a sacrament. It is divinely commanded; it has a visible element; it has a divine promise connected with it.

## II. Baptism is a Means of Grace

Christ has redeemed the world from sin. He has reconciled the world unto God as we hear 2 Cor. 5, 19: "To wit that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the Word of Reconciliation." Christ has done this great work for us and now in order to offer to us and convey to us the benefits of this great work, God employs certain external visible means through which the Holy Spirit works and preserves faith in us. These outward visible means are what we call *Means of Grace*. These means are not something through which we can earn our salvation, but something through which God gives it to us. The older dogmaticians defined it thus: "*Media communicationis remissionis peccatorum sive justificationis ex parte Dei*". Or another, "*Media externa a Deo ordinata, quibus Deus gratiam a Christo acquisitam accipiendam necessariam in hominibus effecit et conservat.*"

Let us then see whether Baptism according to St. Paul's teaching does have that meaning and that power. The first passage that we will consider in this matter is Titus 3, 5: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." First of all, does this passage speak of Baptism? Hodge says of this passage, "The genitive (of regeneration) may be the simple genitive of apposition: 'The washing which is regeneration'. There are two kinds of washing, the outward and the inward. We are saved by that washing which is regeneration, namely, the renewing of the Holy Ghost. This explanation is simple and natural. There



are thus strong reasons for denying that there is any reference to Baptism as an external rite in this passage". (Hodge: Systematic Theology, p. 531). However, if we study this passage in connection with Eph. 5, 26, it becomes very evident that Paul is here speaking of Baptism, for there we have the expression, "with the washing of the water by the Word (*τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι* ) and in this passage we have "By the washing of regeneration (*διὰ λουτροῦ παραγενεσίας*)". The word *λουτρόν* is used in both instances. And in both passages Paul is speaking of the same thing, namely, of cleansing and sanctifying by washing. Both passages treat the same matter; and in Eph. 5, 26 Paul must be speaking of Baptism because he calls it a washing "in the Word."

We have heard that a true means of grace must be a thing that God does for us and not something that we do. What does Paul say in this matter? We read, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done", but "He saved us by the washing of regeneration." Baptism is then something that God does for us. It is a means by which He saves us.

Now let us see what benefits we derive from Baptism. Paul says, "He saved us" (*ἔσωσεν*). This means to make safe, to rescue from danger and destruction. For what did He save us? This becomes evident if we read v. 7 "That being justified by his grace we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." Christ has saved us for eternal life. And now it also becomes evident from what destruction and danger he saved, guarded, kept us, namely, from the danger of eternal destruction. Baptism is then a means by which Christ has saved us from eternal destruction for eternal life, a means by which

He conveys to us the benefits of His suffering and death.

Are there any other benefits? Baptism is called a washing of regeneration (*παλιγενεσις*). This word is defined by Thayer as a rebirth, a renewal, a moral renovation. He calls it the production of a new life consecrated to God, a radical change for the better. Baptism then effects a change a renovation in man. Luther speaks of this passage thus: "Paulus nennt die Taufe einen Bad, in dem nicht nur die Haende oder Fuesse sondern der ganze Leib gereinigt wird; also auch die Taufe macht den Menschen ganz auf einmal rein und selig. ....Also nennt er das Bad nicht ein leiblich Bad sondern ein Bad der Wiedergeburt, das ein solch Bad sei das nicht obenhin die Haut wasche und den Menschen leiblich reinige; sondern seine ganze Natur umkehre und wandle in eine andere Natur, dass die erste Geburt vom Fleisch geschehen, verstoeret werde mit allem Erbe der Suende und Verdammnis. Damit aber ausgedrueckt wird, dass unser Heil auf einmal uns gegeben wird und nicht mit werken zu holen ist. Denn Geburt gibt nicht allein ein Glied, Hand oder Fuss, sondern das ganze Leben, den ganzen Menschen der nicht darum wirkt dass er geboren werde, sondern darum und zuvor geboren wird dass er wirken moege." (Luther XII, 138). Baptism then re-  
vives, reawakens the spiritual life in man. It conveys to man the new life which was won for him by Christ. A difficulty is sometimes found in this. How can baptism effect a regeneration in adults who already believed and were regenerated before they were baptised, as for example the Eunuch who was baptized by Philip? Gerhard~~t~~ answers this satisfactorily (quoted in Pieper III, 310): "Wie wohl diese und viele andere vor dem Gebrauch der Taufe wahrhaft wiedergeboren waren, so geht doch dadurch

der Wirksamkeit der Taufe nichts ab, dass sie ein Bad der Wiedergeburt sei und genannt werde. Dies kann durch das Beispiel des göttlichen Wortes erklärt werden, dass von vielen gehört wird, die schon vorher wiedergeboren waren: nichtsdestoweniger ist das Wort jenes heilsame Mittel, wodurch wir als durch den unvergänglichen Samen wiedergeboren werden, 1 Pet. 1, 23. James 1, 18".

Baptism is called a renewing of the Holy Ghost (ἀνακαίνωσις). This has the connotation of a renewal or complete change for the better. It is a renewal, a change in man effected by the Holy Ghost through baptism. "Thus the water of baptism in itself simple water, is endowed by the power of God and the Holy Ghost with such wonderful properties that it actually becomes the bearer of the salvation of God to the heart of man". (Kretzmann, Popular Commentary).

In summing up now we can conclude from this passage that baptism is not in any way a work of man but a work of the Holy Spirit by which the benefits of Christ's vicarious work are transmitted and conveyed to us, thus agreeing with the definition with which we began.

We have seen that baptism just like the Gospel, saves us from eternal destruction and changes our entire make-up. Now let us see if it also has the power of sanctification that we find in the Gospel. In Eph. 5, 25.26 we read "Christ loved the church and gave himself that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word." Christ sanctified the church (ἐπεκατέσθη). We have here the subjunctive with ἵνα expressing purpose. Christ gave himself so that he might cleanse

His church. *ἁγιασμοῦ* means to make, render or declare sacred or holy, to consecrate, to purify. Christ cleansed the church (*καθάρισμα*). This word also means to clean or cleanse. It is also used in a moral sense to free from the defilements of sin and from guilt. It is the ethical purification emphasizing a changed, rectified relation to God. This cleansing and purifying, this remodeling of the life of the Christian is described as an effect of baptism, for the passage says, "That he might sanctify and cleanse it with (*τῷ λόγῳ*) the washing of water by the Word." This is the instrumental use of the Dative and gives the means or instrument by which this sanctification is to be accomplished, showing that Christ sanctifies His church by means of baptism.

These two passages would in themselves be sufficient proof that baptism is truly a means of grace, but since there is so much argument on this point, and so many false interpretations of some of the pertinent passages, the negative side must be taken up also.

Baptism is not a mere symbol. In order to see what heresy and blasphemy is promulgated on this doctrine, which is so comforting to those who have the correct teaching, let us look at a few quotations. Spurgeon, a man known the world over for his ability to preach, says in one of his sermons on "Baptismal Regeneration", "I find the great error which we have to contend with . . . is one . . . well known to you as the doctrine of baptismal regeneration." "Here is a church"--Church of England--"which teaches every Lord's Day in the Sunday-school, and should teach . . . openly in the Church, all children that they were made members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors

of the kingdom of heaven when they were baptized!" "This"--  
to teach that the mere dropping of so many drops on the brow,  
or even the plunging a person in water, could save the soul--  
"seems to me to be the most mechanical religion, and to be on  
a par with the praying windmills of Thibet." "If this be your  
teaching, that regeneration goes with baptism, I say that it  
looks like the teaching of a spurious church, which has craftily  
invented a mechanical salvation to deceive ignorant, sensual,  
and groveling minds." "If old Rome in her worst days ever per-  
petrated a grosser piece of imposture than this, I do not read  
the things aright." "Baptismal regeneration is preparing step-  
ping-stones to make it easy for men to go to Rome." "It is all  
idolatry". "Here is the essence of Popery, peeping up under  
the barb of decent respect for sacred things." "Of all lies  
which have dragged millions down to hell, I look upon this one  
as the most atrocious--that in a Protestant Church there should  
be found men who swear that baptism saves a soul." "If a man  
says that baptism saves a soul, out upon him, out upon him!"  
"I pray you, never rest upon this wretched and rotten foundation,  
this deceitful invention of Antichrist!" "I beseech you shake  
off this venomous faith into the fire as Paul did the viper."  
"I pray you, do not rest on baptism." "Out of any system which  
teaches salvation by baptism must spring infidelity." (Spurgeon's  
Sermons, Vol. 8, p. 11; quoted in Lehre und Wehre, 55, p. 68).  
We are astounded at his blasphemy; he sounds like a man who has  
tried in every way to justify his ideas but has failed miserably,  
yet being too stubborn to admit the truth he takes to ridicule  
and blasphemy.

The Baptist paper "Sendbote" is not so outspoken in its  
attacks. *It goes about its task in a more underhanded way by*  
attacks. It goes about its task in a more underhanded way by

denying that it teaches that baptism is only an empty sign. We shall let it speak: "Die Taufe ist uns mehr als ein leeres Zeichen, sie ist uns ein hoechst bedeutungsvolles Symbol von dem im Innern erfahrenen Werk der Wiedergeburt, sie ist uns ein Akt des Gehorsams dem Herrn Jesu Christo gegenueber, der gesagt hat: 'Wer da glaubet und getauft wird, der wird selig werden'. Der Gehorsam gegen den Herrn, das Befolgen seines Befehls verleiht einen Segen, welchen diejenigen, die dem Herrn diesen Gehorsam nicht leisten, nicht erfahren." ("Sendbote" quoted in Lehre und Wehre, 52, p. 561). So the baptism of the Baptists is not a work which God does for them, thus giving forgiveness, but it is a work that they do for God in order to earn certain blessings.

However, not alone the sects are wrong on their point. Some of our Lutherans have erred in the same matter. In the middle of the last century when the leaders of the General Synod began the movement called "American Lutheranism", they wrote in their paper, "American Lutheran" of Feb. 21, 1867: "Es gibt nicht und kann nicht geben ein solches Ding als die Wiedergeburt durch die Taufe im eigentlichen Sinn des Wortes. Die Taufe ist das Zeichen und Siegel der Bundesgemeinschaft mit Gott. Das Zeichen ist aber nicht und kann nicht sein die bezeichnete Sache selbst. Nimm ein Beispiel: Du gehst durch die Strassen oder den Weg entlang und siehst an der Front eines Gebaeudes oder in dessen Naehة ein Zeichen, etwa das Wort Hotel. Nun da denkst du doch nicht, dass dies das Hotel selbst sei, sondern nur das Zeichen, das deine Aufmerksamkeit auf das Hotel lenkt. Ferner: Das Siegel eines Dinges ist nicht das untersiegelte Ding selbst. Ein Instrument in unseren Gerichtsboefen

hat alle ihm inwohnende Gueltigkeit, ehe es untersiegelt ist, so gut wie hernach, das Siegel legalisirt es nur. Oder auch, man kann das Siegel auf ein leeres Blatt druecken und dasselbe erst spaeter ausfuellen. So ist es mit der Taufe. Sie ist ein Zeichen der Mitgliedschaft an der sichtbaren Kirche auf Erden und der heiligenden Kraefte des Geistes in der Wiedergeburt, aber nicht diese Kraefte noch die Wiedergeburt selbst." (Quoted in Lehre und Wehre, 13, p. 135). In the Lutheran church we find a doctrine which is wholly Zwinglian. And a no less important man than L. S. Keyser of the General Synod writes: "Surely, most of our children receive in baptism the seeds of regeneration, then when they are taught about Christ and his love, these seminal principles unfold and active faith is produced". (Keyser: Election and Conversion; quoted in Lehre u. Wehre, 60, p. 376).

These quotations are illustrative of some of the false teaching propounded on this important point. Now let us look at some of the passages concerned and see whether they have any basis for these statements.

We take first of all Calvin's interpretation of Titus 3, 5. He says: (in loco): He hath saved us. "He speaks of faith, and shows that we have already obtained salvation, according to that saying--'He that believeth in the Son of God hath passed from death unto life.'

"By the washing of regeneration. This alludes, at least, to baptism, and even I will not object to have this passage expounded as relating to baptism; not that salvation is contained in the outward symbol of water, but because baptism seals to us the salvation obtained by Christ. Since a part of revelation

consists in baptism, that is, so far as it is intended to confirm our faith, Paul properly makes mention of it. The strain of the passage runs thus: God hath saved us by his mercy, the symbol and pledge of which he gave in baptism, by admitting us into his church, and ingrafting us into the body of his Son.

"And of the renewing of the Holy Spirit. Though he mentioned the sign, that he might exhibit to our view the grace of God, yet, that we may not fix our whole attention on the sign, he immediately sends us to the Spirit, that we may know that we are washed by his power, and not by water. Paul, while he speaks directly of the Spirit, at the same time alludes to baptism. It is therefore the Spirit of God who regenerates us, and makes us new creatures; but because his grace is invisible and hidden a visible symbol of it is beheld in baptism."

(Quoted from Calvin in Dale: An Inquiry into the usage of and the Nature of Christic and Patristic Baptism, p. 376).

We have already discussed the true meaning of the text, so we will here just analyse Calvin's argument. "He saved us". There is no reason to take this as being separate from what follows as though the saving were a separate act. It is immediately followed by *διὰ τοῦ πλυνίου*, a prepositional phrase which requires that it be taken as one thought, showing that He saved us by washing. "By the washing of regeneration". Calvin calls baptism a symbol without giving any reason for it. *Διὰ* with the genitive expresses means or instrument by which something is done. Christ then saved us by means of the washing of regeneration which, Calvin admits, must refer to baptism. "And of the renewing of the Holy Spirit." It is true the Spirit of God



does the regenerating, the Spirit makes us new creatures, but baptism is not a mere symbol of that action, it is the means by which and through which the Holy Spirit regenerates.

From this interpretation it is very evident that Calvin first formulated his theory that baptism is a symbol and then proceeded to look for it in the text. The text clearly shows that baptism is not a mere symbol but that it is truly effective for it regenerates and saves.

However, Baptism has other powers. Those who are baptised are made members of the true invisible church. In this connection we must study 1 Cor. 1, 12-15: "Now this I say that every one of you saith, I am of Paul and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptised in the name of Paul? I thank God that I baptised none of you, but Crispus and Gaius; ~~but~~ any should say that I had baptised in mine own name." Here Paul does not state directly that these people were baptised into the name of Christ, but he does imply that. He does not want any of them to feel proud because he, Paul, baptised them, for they are not baptised into the name of him who does the baptising, but into the name of Christ. But now, what does that mean to baptise into the name of someone? Cobern explains thus from the papyri: "The phrase, 'in the name of Christ' (*εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*) received unexpected illumination from the many inscriptions in which slaves are mentioned as being bought by the temple, 'into the name' of a certain deity, meaning that the slave mentioned now belongs to the god, so that 'baptising into the name of' or belief 'in the name' meant according to an ancient and well known formula that he was thus officially marked as belonging to God."

(Cobern: New Archeological Discoveries, p. 35). Thus through baptism we become the property of Christ, we become a part of His possession, a member of His true church upon earth.

1 Cor. 10, 1-4 speaks of the Jews of the Old Testament being baptised into Moses in the cloud and in the sea. Here this same Greek idiom applies very well. In saying that the Children of Israel were baptised into Moses, Paul means that they entered into an intimate relationship with Moses who was the mediator between them and God. They, so to say, became the possession of Moses for they took it upon themselves to follow him faithfully as their leader, even as the believer baptised into Christ makes Him the leader of his life.

Rom. 6, 3: "...baptised into Jesus Christ" and Gal. 3, 27: "As many of you as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ" express this same truth. True, these passages do not speak of baptising "into the name of Christ", but into Christ Himself. However, the name of God is God Himself as He has revealed Himself unto us. Hence the meaning is the same whether we speak of baptism "into the name of Christ" or "into Jesus Christ." These passages also indicate that through baptism we become the property of Christ, we become a member of His church.

As to 1 Cor. 12, 13 there is some argument. Dr. Carson, the Baptist writer says: "In 1 Cor. 12, 13, it is taken for granted, all who are baptized belong to the body of Christ. 'For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.' They who are baptized

are supposed already to belong to the body of Christ; and for this reason they are baptized into it. They are, by baptism, externally united to the body, to which they are internally united by faith. None are here supposed to be baptized upon the expectation, or probability, or possibility that they may yet belong to that body. They are baptized into the body." (Dr. Carson: Baptism in its Mode and Subjects, 212). Upon what does Dr. Carson base the statement that all are already in the body of Christ before their baptism? This verse is introduced by *γάρ* which adduces a cause or reason for the statement made in the preceding verse. "...all the members of that one body, being many are one: so also is Christ, for (because) by one spirit we are all baptised into one body." They are one body because they have been made so by baptism.

Hofmann arrives at the correct conclusion, but not by the right path. He says, "Er (Paulus) denkt hier weder an die Taufhandlung noch bei *ἐκ τοῦ ὄψους* an die Abendmalsfeier, sondern *παρτίσιν* steht eben so aneigentlich gebraucht wie *κορίθει*. Die Begabung mit den Heiligen Geist bezeichnet er zuerst als ein Ueberstroemen und dann um auszudruecken dass er uns nicht blos ueberkommen hat, sondern wie erregender Wein in uns eingegangen ist als ein Traekken mit demselben. Insofern wir nun dieser Geist alle bekommen haben, sind wir alle gliche Massen Glieder des Leibes welchem wir vermoege dieser geistes Taufe angehoren." (Hofmann, Schriftbeweis, Vol. II, 24). Why does Paul speak of baptism if ~~he~~ he does not mean baptism? We are not to speculate about what Paul wanted to say, but to accept what he has said, namely, that "we are all baptised into one body," i.e., we have been made members

of Christ's body, the church, by means of baptism. "The unity of one great church system is effected by baptism. Baptism is the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost. He is the power that influenced our hearts and minds and brought us into the right relation with Christ, added us as members to His body, sealed and attested to our salvation". (Kretzmann, Popular Commentary).

Another power inherent in Baptism, which also proves that it is not a mere symbol is the power of sanctification. This power is expressed in Rom. 6, 3-11 and Gal. 3, 27.

Rom. 6, 3-11: "So many of us as were baptised into Jesus Christ were baptised into His death." From Cobern (New Archaeological Discoveries, p. 33) we have learned that Christians are not merely baptised with reference to Christ but, as the papyri show, anyone baptised into a name of the person of the Godhead thereby became the property of the divine person indicated. Therefore, since we have become the property of Christ and have been baptised into his death, we are delivered from the power of death, as Luther says (v.3): "Naemlich dass ihr nicht allein gewaschen und gereinigt seid nach der Seele durch Vergebung der Suenden, sondern auch damit euer Fleisch und Blut zum Tode verurteilt und uebergeben ist, dass es gar ersaufen soll, dass hinfort eur Leben auf Erden sei ein stetig Sterben der Suende. Denn eure Taufe ist auch nichts anders denn ein gnaediger Wuergen dadurch die Suende an euch ersaeuft, damit ihr unter der Gnade bleibet und nicht durch die Suende unter Gottes Zorn verderbet. ....Denn wie er durch seinen Tod fuer unsere Suende bezahlt und also sie weg genommen, dass sein Tod ist gewesen ein Wuergen und Sterben der Suenden, dass sie

kein Recht und Macht an ihm hat; also auch wir um eines Todes und Sterbens Willen Vergebung der Suenden haben, und also auch der Suende sterben durch dieselbe Kraft dass sie uns nicht muss verdammen, weil wir in Christum getauft und, dadurch er uns solche seine Kraft mitteilt und in uns wirkt". (Luther, Vol. XII, 758). Christ's salvation is our salvation because we were baptised into His death. "We are buried by baptism into death", with the genitive expressing means by which this is accomplished, namely through baptism. We are buried. Only dead people are buried, and in a certain sense we are dead in baptism, for in baptism the believer dies with Christ in a spiritual sense. He passes through death, is really and totally dead. Why was this death necessary? Now follows *ſiva* with Aorist subjunctive giving the purpose of the foregoing. It was necessary that we die spiritually so 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. Luther: "Begraben in den Tod denn er durch seinen Tod auch unsere Suenden mit sich ins Grab genommen und ganz begraben und auch darin gelassen hat, dass sie nun denen, so durch die Taufe in ihm sind ganz und gar getilget und begraben seid und bleiben sollen; wir aber nun einer anderen Lebens leben durch seine Auferstehung, dadurch wir im Glauben Ueberwindung der Suende und des Todes ewige gerechtigkeit und Leben haben". (Luther, Vol. XII, 762). This must be true Paul concludes, because "if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall also be in the likeness of His resurrection." We have died spiritually in baptism. "Our dying to sin and Christ's death are similar. Now if united with Christ in death we shall surely be united with Him in life. The one thing having happened the other is sure to follow. In the case of

Christ H's death and reurrection were intimately connected. He, therefore, that has part in H's death has part in H's reurrection, and is bound to show the new spiritual life which he has received in baptism. All this can be asserted knowing as we do that ~~the~~ old man is crucified with Christ (baptised into H's death) in order that the body of sin may lose all influence, p<sup>o</sup>wer and dominion to the end that we no longer serve sin."

(Kretzmann, Popular Commentary). In conclusion Paul then says verse 11, "Likewise reckon yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Christ Jesus our Lord." We should reckon ourselves dead unto sin. If we are dead then sin can no longer have any power or dominion over us. We need no longer serve sin. We can no longer lead a life of sin. But we should be alive unto God. We should live for God, that is, do His will. Stoeckhardt expresses this quite clearly: "Die Meinung ist: Oder, wenn auch das noch zweifelhaft ist, was ich eben gesagt habe, naemlich dass wir der Suende gestorben sind, so denkt nur an eure Taufe, deren Bedeutung euch wohl bewusst ist. Wir alle, die wir auf Christum Jesum getauft sind, sind ja auf seinen Tod getauft . . . Wir sind auf Christum Jesum getauft, das heisst nichts anderes, als dass wir durch die Taufe zu Christo Jesu in Beziehung, mit ihm in Verbindung und Gemeinschaft gesetzt worden sind. 'Die christliche Taufe ist tatsaechliche Beteiligung an Jesu und dem in ihm verwirklichten Heile. In demselben Sinne heisst es dann aber auch *εἰ τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐπαρτίσθητε* ' (Hofmann.) Christus ist der Heilsmittler geworden und hat uns das Heil erworben durch seinen Tod.... Christus hat durch seinen Tod auch die Macht der Suende gebrochen. Und nun sind wir eben, weil auf Christum, auch auf seinen Tod getauft und also durch die Taufe seines Todes und

der Frucht seines Todes, seiner Erloesung, und zwar der Erloesung nicht nur von der Schuld, sondern auch von der Gewalt der Suende, teilhaftig geworden. Und so sind wir also, die weil auf Christum und seinen Tod getauft, der Gewalt der Suende entnommen, so ist in uns die Macht der Suende gebrochen. In den Tod begraben werden ist nur ein starker Ausdruck fuer sterben. Wer begraben ist, der zaehlt nun zu den Toten. Wir sind der Suende gestorben und sind wirklich, gaenzlich tot fuer die Suende. Das Band, das uns an die Suende fesselte, ist ganz und gar durschnitten." (Stoeckhardt, Roemerbrief, S. 284ff).

Gal. 3, 27. "For as many of you as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ." Here again we have the phrase "baptised into Christ" meaning that we were made the possession of God through baptism. We are placed in a new relationship to Christ. He brought us into the innermost communion with him. For a correct understanding of this we need only to quote the words of Luther : "But the putting on of Christ according to the gospel consists not in imitation, but in a new birth and a new creation; that is to say in putting on Christ's innocency, his righteousness, etc. We are clothed with a leather coat of Adam which is a mortal garment, and a garment of sin. This garment, this corrupt and sinful nature we received from Adam. This Old Man must be put off with all his works, that of the children of Adam we may be made the children of God. This is not done by changing of a garment, or by any laws or works, but by a new birth, and by the renewing of the inward man which is done in Baptism as Paul saith, 'All ye that are baptised have put on Christ'. For besides that they which are regenerated and renewed by the Holy Ghost to a heavenly righteousness and

to eternal life, there riseth in them also a new light and a new flame; there rise in them new and holy affections; as the fear of God, true faith, and assured hope. There beginmeth in them also a new will. And this is to put on Christ truly according to the gospel." (Luther, Galatians, Erdman Ed., p. 315).

Dr. Carson says of this passage, "The Apostle does not state the import of an ordinance of God in Gal, 3, 27; he does not allege that this submission to baptism was an evidence of putting on Christ, for it is not such; but it is a figure of putting on Christ. Some of them might not turn out to be real believers, but in their baptism they were taken for such."

(Carson: Baptism in its Mode and Subjects, p. 213). Here it is evident that Dr. Carson is at a loss to explain his theory that baptism is a mere empty sign. He recognizes the futility in trying to argue away this passage. The passage calls baptism a putting on of Christ, but this doesn't suit his purpose, so he brazenly contradicts the passage and says that baptism is a sign of the putting on of Christ. He can find no basis for his statements in the text.

Col. 2, 11.12. This passage is a parallel to Rom. 6, 3. Paul here again speaks of being buried with Christ in baptism.

*συρταφέντες* the Aorist passive participle is in this case used in the causal sense (Robertson and Davis: Short Grammar of Greek N.T., 429). Now let us read the verses once more.

"In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands in putting off the body of sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ because you were buried with Him in baptism." Reading it in that way it becomes evident that *baptism is the cause or the means by which the body of the* baptism is the cause or the means by which the "body of the



sins of the flesh is put off." Baptism does have the power to sanctify. "Paul does not merely leave them with the statement that they have been made full in Christ which rendered circumcision unnecessary, but adds that they have already received circumcision, not material but spiritual, not the removal of a fragment of the body but the complete putting off the body of flesh." (Expositors' Greek Testament). "The circumcision of Christ, the stripping off of the old sinful nature in man, is baptism. That is the visible means by which the Lord works regeneration in our hearts. The Old Man in us was mortally wounded when the Lord received us as His own in baptism. We are buried with Christ by baptism into death, Rom. 6, 4, because in baptism we become partakers of the spiritual gifts which He earned for us by His entire life, death and resurrection" (Kretzmann, Popular Commentary).

From these passages in the Epistles of Paul it is very clear that Paul taught that baptism is a Means of Grace. Not all of the objections of the false teachers have been refuted, but that was not our purpose. We aim to study the Epistles themselves to see what they teach. The false teachings were brought in merely to show the folly and hopelessness in trying to hold the teaching that baptism is a mere symbol.

The difference between Baptism and the Gospel. Does Baptism in itself, that is, does the outward act of baptism convey this grace of God? The Roman Catholic Church teaches that it does, "Wenn jemand sagt, es werde durch eben diese Sakramente des Neuen Bundes die Gnade nicht kraft vollbrachten Werken (ex opere operato) gegeben, sondern der Glaube an die goettliche

Verheissung reiche allein hin, die Gnade zu empfangen, der sei verflucht." (Sessions, VII, Can. 8). But here St. Paul does not agree. He says Eph, 5, 26: "...cleanse it with the washing of water in the word." (ἐν ῥήματι). This prepositional phrase is here used attributively. It modifies and defines the washing, distinguishing this particular washing from every other kind. It is a washing that is connected with the Word. Not every kind of washing is baptism, but just this one special kind which is done in the Word, that is, in connection with both the divine command and the divine promise. It is not the water which makes the baptism effective, but the Word that is with the water.

Is then every baptised person saved? Not according to Col. 2, 12: "Buried with him in baptism wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God." Faith is also necessary in baptism. Baptism does not force salvation upon us, but through faith we must make the benefits conveyed in baptism our own. Being buried with Christ and dead to sin, we now, by the effective working of the Word in baptism through faith also become partakers of Christ's resurrection. The blessings of His resurrection are transmitted to us by faith.

If baptism also saves by the Word and through faith is it not just the same as the Gospel? What then is the real value of baptism? Chemnitz explains this very well. "Was daher Gott betrifft, so bietet derselbe daher dar und theilt mit jene seine Gnade, welche zur Seligkeit noethig ist, so dass der Glaube in jenem Gegenstande oder Mittel finden kann, alles was zur Seligkeit noethig ist. Und zwar (wie Chrysostomus sagt) wenn wir Engel waeren, so haetten wir weiter kein Zeichen

noetzig. Aber die Schwachheit des Fleisches hindert, stoert, zieht ab und schwaecht den Glauben. Denn es ist eine harte und schwere Sache, an dem, was im Wort vorgelegt wird, obgleich es nicht in die Erscheinung tritt, dennoch mit fester Herzenszuversicht zu haften, Ebr. 11., ja wider Hoffnung auf Hoffnung zu glauben, Roem. 4., da ja in diesem Leben das Herz immer die Unterstuetzungen der Sinne sucht. Ausserdem wird auch der Glaube, wenn er dafuer haelt, dass die Verheissung Gottes im Allgemeinen wahr sei, doch namentlich ueber die Frage beunruhigt: geht sie auch mich fuer meine Person an? Daher hat Gott, der da reich ist an Barmherzigkeit, um uns den Reichtum seiner Guete zu zeigen und zu preisen, uns seine Gnade nicht allein auf eine Weise, nemlich durch das blosser Wort, mittheilen wollen, sondern er hat unserer Schwachheit durch gewisse Mittel zu Haelfe kommen wollen, nemlich durch Einsetzung der an die Verheissungen des Evangeliums geknuepfen Sacramente, d.i. gewisser Zeichen, Bebraeuche oder Ceremonien, die in die Sinne fallen, um dieselben zu erinnern, zu unterwiesem und uns zu vergewissern, dass dasjenige, was wir auesserlich in sichtbarer Gestalt handeln sehen, inwendig durch Gottes Kraft und Macht gewirkt werde, denn wie das Wort in die Ohren faellt, und die Herzen schlaegt, so faellt die Ceremonie der Sacramente in die Augen, um die Herzen zu bewegen, dass sie nicht zweifeln, Gott handle mit uns und will nach dem Wort in uns wirksam sein zur Seligkeit.. Gott hat daher die Sacramente eingesetzt, dass sie auesserliche und sichtbare Zeichen und Unterpfaender der Gnade und des Willens Gottes gegen uns seien, durch die er als durch ein feierliches sichtbares Zeugnis bezeugt, dass die Verheissung jeden einzelnen angeht, der dieselbe im Gebrauch der



### III. The Mode of Baptism.

We have heard that baptism is a sacrament and as such it must have a divine institution. Now let us see what requirements there are in this divine command as to the words to be spoken at the performance of the ceremony and as to the way in which the visible element is to be applied.

The Baptismal Formula. It is maintained that Paul in his epistles knows nothing of the baptismal command of Matt. 28, 19, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." This formula is nowhere quoted in the Epistles of Paul. Furthermore it is stated that Paul taught a different formula, namely in Rom. 6, 3, "So many of us as were baptised into Jesus Christ (*ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν*) and Gal. 3, 27, "As many of you as have been baptised into Christ (*εἰς Χριστὸν*). In the Acts of the Apostles there are other passages that have *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*) This is supposed to be a new formula, but let us look at the passages a little more closely. In doing so we find that Paul is here not at all speaking of the mode of baptism, but simply describes baptism with these words so that his hearers will understand that he is speaking of that baptism which was divinely commanded by Christ and is thus based on His name. There is here no mention of the baptismal formula, baptism is merely described as being founded upon the name of Christ, hence upon Christ himself, for baptism is made possible only through the vicarious satisfaction of Christ, Eph. 5, 25.26, "Even as Christ also loved the church and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it, with the washing of the water by the Word." Further-

more it must be noted here that faith in Jesus is faith in the Triune God as Dr. Pieper clearly explains it, "Und was die Taufe εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ , auf oder auf den Namen Christi Jesu hin, betrifft, so ist nicht zu vergessen, dass das Bekenntnis zum Namen Christi stets das Bekenntnis zur Heiligen Dreieinigkeit in sich begreift. Dies ist klare Lehre der Schrift. Wenn in dem Namen Jesu (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ )such beugen aller derer Knie, die im Himmel und auf Erden und unter der Erde sind, und alle Zungen bekennen, dass Jesus Christus der Herr sei, so ehren sie damit zugleich Gott den Vater (Phil. 2, 10.11) und beten sie zugleich den Heiligen Geist an, ohne den niemand Jesum einen Herrn zu heissen vermag (1 Kor. 12, 3). Scherzer sagt richtig nach dem Vorgange von Kirchenvaetern: "Das Bekenntnis zu Christo ist das Bekenntnis zur ganzen Dreieinigkeit." Wozu also kuenstlich die "kurzen Ausdruecke": "auf den Namen Jesu Christi" usw. im Gegensatz zu der Taufe auf den Namen des Vaters und des Sohnes und des Heiligen Geistes geltend machen? Zudem wissen wir von den Aposteln selbst gewiss, dass sie niemand getauft haetten, der zwar auf Christum, aber nicht zugleich auf den Vater und den Heiligen Geist getauft werden wollte. Dies geht daraus hervor, dass sie durchweg die Erkenntnis des Vaters, des Sohnes und des Heiligen Geistes ineinander schliessen, 2 Kor. 13, 13: "Die Gnade unsers Herrn Jesu Christi und die Liebe Gottes und die Gemeinschaft des Heiligen Geistes sei mit euch allen!" (Pieper, Christliche Dogmatik, III, 304 f). Hence there is no basis for the theory that St. Paul did not know of the baptismal formula as it is recorded by Matthew.

... the intermissionists will say, "Hold on, what about  
 ... 2, 4 and Gal. 3, 12, where Paul speaks of baptism as a work

Application of the Element. As to the application of the water in baptism, St. Paul makes no definite statement. He does not tell us how it is to be done. He simply speaks of baptising. The word "baptise" is not very descriptive to us because it is only a transliteration of the Greek word. However, we have already looked into the real meaning of this word and have found that it means or implies a cleansing by the use of water. This water may be applied to the parts cleansed in any suitable way. This cleansing or washing might have been done in a basin as we usually wash today, or it might be done under a faucet of running water, or by having someone pour the water over the hands in a slow stream while the person himself rubbed them as was the custom in some of the ceremonial cleansings of the Jews (Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, Vol. II, p. 11) or this might be done by sprinkling as was often done in the ceremonial cleansings in the Old Testament (Num. 19, 13.19). From this word then we cannot make any fast rules as to the manner of applying the water in baptism.

However, St. Paul uses another word in referring to baptism, namely *λούω* in Titus 3, 5 and Eph. 5, 26. We have established that both of these passages refer to baptism. Now, let us see what *λούω* means. This also means simply to wash, or bathe without specifying any definite way of doing so.

Our conclusion must then be that St. Paul teaches baptism without specifying any mode at all just as the other apostles did.

However, the immersionists will say, "Hold on, what about Rom. 6, 4 and Col. 2, 12, where Paul speaks of baptism as a burial?"

Are those passages not a proof that Paul taught immersion?"

Let us see. These passages can be treated together since they express the same thoughts. Dr. Carson is very sure of this ground when he says, "All eminent scholars will confess, as plainly as prudence will permit them, that we have both the meaning of the word and the inspired explanation of the mode in our favor..... But the thing is so plain in itself, that if all the men on earth should deny it, I could not think otherwise of it than I do..... Any one who understands the words, will be able to understand the assertion as clearly as Newton or Locke. Buried with Christ by baptism must mean that baptism has a resemblance to Christ's burial. Were the angel Gabriel to hesitate, I would order him to school.....Believers are buried with Christ by baptism, and it is by baptism, also, they die with him. Death, burial, and resurrection are all expressly in the emblem.... There are two distinct emblems in baptism: one of purification by water, another of death, burial and resurrection, by immersion....But the fact is that baptism, as far as it is here expounded, refers to death, burial, and resurrection, without any mention of purification, or any allusion to it. Baptism is here spoken of, not with respect to the water, but with respect to the mode. In this there are death, burial, and resurrection" (pp. 383-386).

"They are literally immersed, but the burial is equally figurative as the death; and they die in baptism as well as they are buried in baptism. Indeed it is by being buried that they die. That this figurative burial is under water is not in the passage: this is known from the rite, and is here supplied by ellipsis" (p. 411). (Carson: Baptism in its Mode and Subjects). But does Dr. Carson have any basis for his stand? Paul is quo-



ted as saying "Buried with Christ by baptism". This is falsifying Paul's words by omitting the phrase that immediately Paul's follows, namely, "into his death." This phrase has been cut off from the rest because it did not fit into the theory that he is trying to substantiate. By tearing things from their context in that way one could establish most anything from the Bible. When this phrase is taken in its context as it should be, we find that Paul here makes no mention whatever of the mode of baptism. He is speaking about its powers and effects. In verse 1 he sets up the question "Shall we continue in sin so that grace may abound?" and then in verses 2 and 3 brings the answer, "God forbid, how shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not that as many of us as were baptised into Jesus Christ were baptised into His death?" The meaning is this: If there is any doubt as to what I have said before, namely that we are dead to sin, then call to mind your baptism. Through baptism you have been made partakers of the salvation won by Christ. And being baptised into the death of Christ, which took away from sin its power, we are now also freed from the dominion of sin. To be buried into death means the same as to die. Whoever has died to sin is entirely freed from sin, sin has no power over him. Is there any hint at a mode of baptism in that argument?

In this connection it is also interesting to note that the word *τάφω* used here by Paul for "bury" does not necessarily imply a covering entirely. It was not always so understood among the Greeks. Sophocles in his "Antigone" related how Antigone went out to the battle field at the risk of her life to "bury" (*τάφω*) her brother. For this very act she was later

condemned to death because she had transgressed the command of the king who had commanded that her brother should not be buried. But what do we read? How did she bury her brother? She did not put him under the ground. No, she didn't even cover him with a pile of dirt. We are told that she secretly went to the place where her brother was lying on the field and threw some dust upon him. That was called "burying" among the Greeks. So, even if this passage in Romans could refer to the mode of baptism, it still would not prove the point for the immersionists.

These are the only arguments that the immersionists can base upon the Epistles of Paul. We have seen how futile and far fetched these arguments are and must come to the conclusion that Paul does not teach any definite mode of baptism, but simply refers to it as a washing.

Children are to be baptized. There are sects who stand very firmly upon the statement that children are not to be baptized. We must see whether they have any grounds for their contention. In the Epistles of Paul there are a number of passages that come into consideration in this matter.

Rom. 8. 3. "As many of us as were baptised". We find here the term *hos*: "as many as". This is used not in the partitive sense as though only a part of them had been baptised, but rather in the distributive sense meaning "each and every one of you, when you were baptised, put on Christ." Paul is here writing to the congregation at Rome (Rom. 1, 7, "To all that be in Rome beloved of God, called to be saints"), and in the congregation were children as well as adults. Each and every one of the members of the congregation had put on Christ, that

#### IV. Who is to be Baptised.

In the Epistles of St. Paul we find no definite statements as to who is to be baptised and who is not to be baptised, but in Eph. 5, 25.26 Paul states that "Christ loved the church and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of the water by the Word." The entire church is to be baptised, that is all the members of each congregation.

Adults are to be baptised. It is self evident that adults, men as well as women, are included in the congregation, in the church, and therefore they are to be baptised. In the Epistles of Paul we have several examples of adults being baptised. In 1 Cor. 1, 16 Paul relates that he himself baptised Gaius and Crispus, and also the entire household of Stephanas. From this it is very evident that adults are to be baptised.

Children are to be baptised. There are sects who stand very firmly upon the statement that children are not to be baptised. We must see whether they have any grounds for their contention. In the Epistles of Paul there are a number of passages that come into consideration in this matter.

Rom. 6, 3. "As many of us as were baptised". We find here the term *ὡς* "as many as". This is used not in the partitive sense as though only a part of them had been baptised, but rather in the distributive sense meaning "each and every one of you, when you were baptised, put on Christ." Paul is here writing to the congregation at Rome (Rom. 1, 7, "To all that be in Rome beloved of God, called to be saints"), and in the congregation were children as well as adults. Each and every one of the members of the congregation had put on Christ, that

is they had become the property of Christ in their baptism. This same argument applies also to Gal. 3, 27 where *ὅσος* is used in the same way.

1 Cor. 12, 13. "For by one Spirit we are all baptised into one body." Eph. 4, 5.6. "One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all." In these two passages Paul speaks of baptising and yet he refers to all (*πάντες*) of the people at these respective congregations. Here again he makes no distinction between the adults and the children. Dr. Carson bases the following argument upon Eph. 4, 5. "We learn from Eph. 4, 5 that there is but one baptism. Now as the baptisms of the commission cannot possibly extend to infants, if there is such a thing as infant baptism, there must be two baptisms. If, then, there is but one baptism, there can be no infant baptism." (Carson: Baptism in its Mode and Subjects, p. 212). We answer, "Christian Baptism" (the "one Baptism") works salvation; infants by the admission of Dr. Carson, receive salvation, therefore, the baptism of the commission, since it is the "one baptism" of Christianity, does apply to infants.

Eph. 5, 26. "Christ gave Himself for the Church "that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of the water by the Word." "Christ gave Himself for the Church". Certainly we would not say that the children were not included in the vicarious work that Christ did for the Church. And if the children are included in this they cannot be omitted in the next phrase, "That He might sanctify it" (*αὐτῆς*). This *αὐτῆς* clearly refers back to *ἐκκλησία*. The children as well as the adults are sanctified, and this sanctification is effected "by the wash-

ing of water" (τῷ λουτρῷ the Dative of means as instrument). Here again the children are included.

Titus 3, 5. Let us put up the following syllogism: 1. Everything that is born of flesh must be regenerated by the water and the spirit if it is to enter the kingdom of God. (Titus 3, 5, Not by works of righteousness which we have done but according to his mercy, he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost). 2. All people also small children are born of flesh. (Eph. 2, 3, And were by nature the children of wrath. Rom. 3, 23, For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God). 3. Conclusion: All people, also small children, have need of the regeneration by the water and the spirit, if they are to enter the kingdom of God.

1 Cor. 1, 16. "And I baptised also the household of Stephanas". οἶκος means originally the house, that is, the building itself, but by metonymy it has the meaning of the household, the inmates of a house, all of the persons forming one family. It is hardly probable that a family would be without children, and if the Anti-paedo-baptists wish to get around this passage it is up to them to prove that there were no children, for we are taking οἶκος in its usual sense.

Col. 2, 11, 12. Here Paul clearly states that baptism is taking the place of the Old Testament sacrament of circumcision. Dr. Carson himself says, "Circumcision and baptism correspond in meaning. They both relate to the removal of sin, the one by cutting, the other by washing." (Carson; Baptism in 1st Mode and Subjects, p. 229). The removal of sin certainly is a spiritual blessing. In Genesis 17, 9-12 we are clearly told that the

children were included in the covenant which God made with Abraham, for we read, "And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generation." Conclusion: Children were commanded to be circumcised. Baptism was instituted to take the place of circumcision. Hence, children also must be baptised.

1 Cor. 10, 1-4. Here we have another reference to the Old Testament. We read, "And were all baptised into Moses in the cloud and in the sea." We have here a type of the New Testament sacrament of baptism. "The cloud and sea together become the elements by which they (the Israelites) were cleansed to the Lord, by which they were separated as people of the covenant. They were God's seals and pledges of His merciful promise just as the sacraments are today." (Kretzmann: Popular Commentary). Now let us look at these verses carefully. Five times we find the word "all". "That all our fathers were under the cloud." "And all passed through the sea." "All baptised unto Moses." "Did all eat of the same spiritual meat." "Did all drink the same spiritual drink." Paul makes it very emphatic that each and every one of them had done those things. And the emphasis is made all the stronger by the contrast in the following verses. "But with many God was displeased. They had all taken part in these benefits, but not nearly all remained true. All, including the children took part in this Old Testament type of baptism, why should they not take part in baptism itself?

That then is what St. Paul says about infant baptism. Is there still any doubt concerning its validity?

Baptism for the Dead. In 1 Cor. 15, 29 we have the statement "else what shall they do which are baptised for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptised for the dead?" Robertson says, "This obscure passage still remains a puzzle to the interpreters." It would seem to be a puzzle when we find that there are more than twenty interpretations that have been proposed. However, the majority of these interpretations are pure inventions of reason. The best way is to take *step* in its most natural sense, that is, in the local sense of "over". The Christians were baptised over the dead. They had themselves baptised over the graves and sepulchres of their departed ones. Luther explains their reasons for this as follows: "In the days of Paul this article of resurrection was unknown to the heathen and seemed an unheard-of doctrine to the most learned men of Greece, although they went so far as to fancy that the soul after quitting would continue to live, without arriving at any certain conclusions in this matter; but they were entirely ignorant of the fact that the entire man will rise again, and soul and body will be reunited. For this reason it seemed hard to them to believe the preaching of the apostles, and those who did believe had to suffer much ridicule. Accordingly, to strengthen the faith of people in this article, they had themselves baptized among the graves for a sure sign that they firmly believed the dead who lay buried there, and over whose graves they were being baptized, would rise again. They believed the resurrection so firmly that they pointed their finger, as it were, at the graves that were to open. We might likewise administer baptism publicly in a graveyard or common burial-ground. There is a legend, too, that the church at Aquileja used to recite the words in the Article thus: 'I be-

lieve the resurrection of this flesh.' This was done, no doubt, for the purpose of clearly and properly teaching and professing the article of the resurrection of the flesh. The blessed apostles and fathers used to observe this custom in order to inculcate this article both by words and symbolical acts, because this teaching was still new, just as we must teach our rude youths and drive home our teaching by ceremonies and external acts, in order that they must grasp it with their hands, so to speak, and be less inclined to doubt; otherwise they will readily forget it and lose it out of their hearts. Thus they used to baptize persons among the grave-diggers, as if to say: I am having myself baptized here, as a witness to my faith that the dead who are lying here will all rise, and that I decline the belief that only spooks shall appear here, or that other bodies than those that were buried will rise. I believe that the very Paul and Peter who died and were buried, or, to speak with the Creed, this flesh which is now seen standing here, going there, being buried here, will arise. Just as the very same Christ who was born of Mary was nailed to the cross, truly rose, and not another; for He shows His disciples the prints in His hands and His side." (Luther 8, 1196 f; quoted in Theological Quarterly, Vol. XXI, p. 27).

Meyer in his commentary, however, objects to this interpretation, because if *ὁ σῶμα* is here so understood it is the only example in the New Testament where that is the case, and therefore it is very unlikely that it is to be understood in that way here. Winer answers, "Seltsam ist es wenn Meyer jene Erklärung (ueber den Todten) deshalb sprachlich unzulässig findet, weil *ὁ σῶμα* sonst nicht im localen Sinne im Neuen Testament vorkommt."



Koennte denn diese einfachste locale Bedeutung nicht blos an einer Stelle vorkommen?" (Winer, Gr. S. 342).

This interpretation is also taken by other later exegetes. Graemer says, "Das *παρρηγοῦναι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν* ist ein Sichttaufen-lassen der Todten halber; *ὑπὲρ* Angabe des Beweggrundes (vgl. Roem. 15, 8). Es ist nicht gesagt dass die Taufe den Todten zugute kommt, sondern dass die Todten, sofern sie auferstehen werden, Lebenden Veranlassung geben sich taufen zu lassen; dass die aus solchem Beweggrunde haben taufen lassen, keine Hoffnung haben und eben darum ihre Taufe fuer sie Zwecklos ist wenn ueberhaupt Todte nicht auferstehen werden." (Graemer, Woerterbuch, S. 127).

The Mormons insist that *ὑπὲρ* must be taken in a vicarious sense, namely, that Paul speaks of baptizing in behalf of, or for the sake of the dead. They make this passage the basis for their teaching that there is a baptism for the benefit of the dead. However, even if Paul did mean to say that there were some who were baptizing for the dead that still goes not give us the right to do that. Paul does not sanction the custom, but only shows that the custom would be without sense and reason if there were no resurrection of the body. From other passages of Scripture it is very clear that these people had the wrong idea of baptism for a man lives by his own faith and not by the faith of anyone else, as Peter says, "Repent and be baptised, everyone of you, in the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts 2, 38). But now, lest anyone say that Peter and Paul had variant ideas in this matter we will also examine Gal. 3, 26, "For ye are all (*πάντες*) the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." From the following verse we conclude that *πάντες*

is here used distributively. Each one is a child of God by faith, namely by his own faith.

This passage may still be a puzzle to the interpreters, but one thing is clear about it, and that is that we cannot make it a basis for the false teaching of "baptism for the dead."

#### V. The Use of Baptism.

To be used only once. While the other Means of Grace are to be used often by the believer, Scripture nowhere states that baptism is to be repeated. On the contrary, when baptism is once applied it should comfort and exhort the believer throughout his life as Paul says, Gal. 3, 26.27, "For as many of you as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." *Ἐπαρτίσθητε*. Paul here used the Aorist which presents the action as punctiliar. "At one time or another you were or are baptised." This cannot possibly imply a repetition of the act. The aorist is used in the same way in Rom. 6, 3.4.; 1 Cor. 1, 13; 1 Cor. 10, 2; and Titus 3, 5. This baptism is to last throughout life and therefore Paul again and again reminds the Christians of their baptism. For example in Gal. 3, 26.27 he reminds them that they have put on Christ through baptism and that now they have become children of God without the law, through faith; in Rom. 6, 3f he reminds them that through baptism they are now dead to sin and should live accordingly; in 1 Cor. 12, 13

he reminds them that through baptism they now belong to the Body of Christ. Thus we see that Paul never tells them to have themselves baptised again but always reminds them of the one time when they were baptised.

Confirmation. The Greek Catholics and also in a manner the Roman Catholics teach that confirmation serves as a complement to baptism. However, we nowhere find in Scripture that the Christians are reminded of their confirmation as they were reminded of their baptism, as we just saw above. Nowhere is confirmation made a part of baptism. And yet we know from Acts 8 that the apostles instructed adults before they baptised them. Philip instructed the eunuch, "and preached unto him Jesus" (v. 35). Then upon the eunuch's confession of faith (v. 37) he was baptised.

Paul does not mention instruction in connection with baptism. However, he does speak of instruction. In Gal. 6, 6 he says, "Let him that is taught in the word communicate to him that teacheth in all good things." Paul does advocate instruction in Christian doctrine although he says nothing about it in connection with baptism.

Conclusion. In this examination of Paul's teaching we again find that the differences between the teachings of Paul and those of the other apostles are not as great as is maintained by many critics. It is only natural that there be some differences, that there be some new ideas expressed, otherwise there would be no real purpose for so many more books of Scripture. However, in the really great and fundamental doctrines we find that all of the writers of Scripture agree perfectly. This fact

Bibliography

also applies to baptism. Paul teaches baptism just as it is taught in other parts of Scripture. He makes baptism a divinely instituted sacrament, and ascribes to it the supernatural powers of regeneration and sanctification. He advocates the same mode of application as the other apostles do. His subjects of baptism and his use of the sacrament are the same as those prescribed by the other Sacred Writers.

Hebrew Old Testament  
 Vincent Ward Hebrew  
 Robinson's Hebrew Grammar  
 Walton and Waddingham Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament  
 Cook's Commentary (for Judith)  
 Concordia Theological Monthly Vol. III  
 Theological Monthly Vol. Quarterly Vol. XIII  
 The Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament  
 Walton and Waddingham, London  
 The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament  
 Longman, Green, Brown, and Longmans, London  
 Elzevir's Latin, The Apostolic Fathers  
 Latin-Fathers Vol. VII  
 Giffes, Baptism and Eucharist  
 Expeller's Greek New Testament  
 Eberhard's Bible  
 Krauss's Popular Commentary  
 Neander, Romantische  
 Neander, Epistolische  
 Neander, Notes on Galatians

## Bibliography

- Kittel Woerterbuch**
- Passow Woerterbuch**
- Thayer Lexicon**
- Lidell and Scott Greek Lexicon**
- Robinson Greek Lexicon**
- The Septuagint Translation**
- Greek New Testament**
- Hebrew Old Testament**
- Vincent Word Studies**
- Robertson's Word Studies**
- Moulton and Miligan Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament**
- Cook's Commentary (for Judith)**
- Concordia Theological Monthly Vol. III**
- Theological (Monthly Vol) Quarterly Vol. XIII**
- The Englishmen's Greek Concordance of the New Testament**  
Walton and Maberly, London
- The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament**  
Longman, Green, Brown, and Longmans, London
- Kirsopp Lake, The Apostolic Fathers**
- Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol. VII**
- Gerfen, Baptisein and Eucharist**
- Expositor's Greek New Testament**
- Hirschberger Bibel**
- Kretzmann Popular Commentary**
- Stoeckhardt, Roemerbrief**
- Stoeckhardt, Epheserbrief**
- Fuerbringer, Notes on Galatians**

Bibliography Continued

- Luther Saemtliche Werke, Volumes IV, VII, and XII
- Luther, Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (Erdmann Edition)
- Hodge, Romans
- Pieper, Christliche Dogmatik
- Mueller, Christian Dogmatics
- Seeberg, Christliche Dogmatik
- Engelder, Notes on Dogmatics
- K. v. Hofmann, Der Schriftbeweis
- Strong, Systematic Theology
- Hodge, Systematic Theology
- Dale, An Inquiry into the Usage of Baptizo and the Nature of Christic  
and Patristic Baptasm
- Carson, Baptism in its Mode and Subjects
- Gobern, New Archeological Discoveries
- Robertson and Davis, A New Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament
- Zeitschrift zur Neu Testamentlichen Wissenschaft Vol. XXX
- Lehre Und Wehre, Volumes V, VIII, XII, XIII, XXVI, XXX, LII, LIII, LV,  
LVI, LVII, LX.
- Sophocles, Antigone
- Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah