

MABEL CLEMENT

by

J. M. SALLEE

ECONOMY PRINTERS ASHLAND, KENTUCKY

CHAPTER TWELVE

The appointed night again invited the people of Sterling to repair to Mr. Clement's. It was another lovely night; and when Mabel came down from her room, which she had used for some days as a closet and study in which she held sweet communion, with GOD through prayer and the Word, insuring Divine aid, she found the room filled to running over.

She could hardly press through the crowd to her accustomed place. All were present who had attended the other meetings; also several other ladies and gentlemen well-known in Sterling. It was ever so embarrassing to Mabel to enter the room, for the eager eyes of all gazed into her flushed face. Our heroine was gaining a widespread notoriety. Her name was on all lips; and people wondered how a girl could so successfully cope with a theologian, such as Dr. Stanly was supposed to be.

The discussion was resumed by Arthur, who said:

"Let us begin our work of investigation. I understand the Doctor means to take a position from which he cannot be driven by logic and Scripture combined. That is what we all wish, as he says, stakes driven by the hammer of Divine truth - set in firmly among the rocks of truth, so they can remain forever unshaken by cunning and sophistry. If it meets the approbation of all, I hope the Doctor will proceed to set up his stake and produce the hammer and use it."

Dr. Stanly, who had been boasting on the street that evening what he would do, turned red in the face, cleared his throat and hesitated.

Now, the Doctor had been anxious for this thing to stop. He saw plainly that it was breeding mischief and working injury to the cause for which he stood. But the solemn conviction had stolen over him that it would not do for him at this stage of the action to back down.

He trembled lest there was about to be a great revolution in Sterling on the subject of religion. He felt that the die was cast, the Rubicon was crossed, and he must go on and see what was his fate and that of his cause and make the best possible of the case. There was no alternative; he was not left to choose; his course was marked out by circumstances, perhaps by destiny; he was hedged in by stern necessity to go forward.

The river being crossed and the bridge burned, "sink or swim, survive or perish," he must go on to inexorable fate.

With this conviction wrought in his mind he had come to the meeting determined, if possible, to

do something to retrieve his lost reputation and save the beloved temple of Campbellism which was crumbling away. After some hesitation the Doctor said boldly, while his face shone and his eyes sparkled with passion, and his lip was set with determination, "If I am to lead in the discussion tonight, I shall go to the day of Pentecost. Then the first Gospel sermon was preached, the first Scriptural baptism was administered, the reign of grace began, the foundation of CHRIST's Kingdom was laid by the apostles and the conditions on which sins are forever to be remitted were fully divulged."

"I must say, Doctor," said Mabel, "I never heard a speech so brief as yours that contained so many errors."

"Point out the errors," said the Doctor.

"Very well," replied Mabel, "I shall with pleasure comply with your request.

1. There is not the shadow of evidence of the truthfulness of your assertion that the Gospel was preached first on the day of Pentecost. Why, JESUS Himself, as we are told in the Bible, preached the gospel.

2. JESUS made and baptized disciples. Were not such baptisms Scriptural? Who has the discourteous hardihood to deny it?

3. The law and the prophets were until John, but truth and righteousness came by JESUS CHRIST (Luke 16:16 and John 1:17); hence grace began before Pentecost.

4. The apostles never laid the foundation of the Kingdom. It was set up before Pentecost: **'The law and the prophets were until John; since that time the Kingdom of God is preached and every man presseth into it'** (Luke 16:16). How press into a thing not set up, not yet in existence? What folly!

5. As to the law of pardon not being divulged till Pentecost, I would say, the conditions on which persons are to be pardoned, saved, have eternal life, etc., etc., were set forth clearly before Pentecost, as they were then, or afterwards.

So all you have said, Doctor, belongs to Campbellism, not the Bible."

"I dispute all you say," said the Doctor, with nervous emphasis. "But what I wish is to give Peter's language and show clearly what were, then, have been ever since and are now, the conditions of remission."

"Proceed, Doctor," replied Mabel, "that is the question we are here to discuss."

"Here then is the text: **'Repent, and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost'** (Acts 2:38). Here are specified two things to be done and two blessings to follow as consequents. Peter commanded them to repent and be baptized; and he promised them on these two conditions the remission of sins and the gift of the HOLY GHOST.

Repentance and baptism are here equally essential, - you can't separate them without doing violence to the Word of GOD. It follows then, if Peter told the truth, that persons cannot receive pardon or the HOLY SPIRIT without baptism. Here is the whole matter in a nutshell told so plainly that **'wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein.'**

"I am glad that the Doctor has spoken so unambiguously," replied Mabel. "I wish to remove some of the rubbish out of the way before we come to the main question. First, the Doctor says repent and baptize cannot be separated. This will not do. One verb is plural and the other singular. I am not a Greek scholar; but Mr. Tibbs and Mr. Manly are. I refer this matter to them."

They examined the Greek and said:

"You are correct: repent is plural and has 'ye' understood for its subject, while **'be baptized'** is singular and has for its subject **"every one of you."**

"So you all perceive," added Mabel, "that as **'every one'** is singular, it can be the subject of **'be baptized'** only and not of **'repent.'** Hence Peter did not say repent for the remissions of sins, but be baptized for the remission of sins. What did Peter tell them to do for remission? Not to repent, but to be baptized.

Again, the Doctor says that Peter meant that persons could not receive the gift of the HOLY SPIRIT before and hence without baptism. This also is a mistake.

When Peter went to Cornelius and his company and preached the gospel, they received the gift of the HOLY GHOST before baptism. The fact that GOD had poured out on them the gift of the Spirit as He did on the Jews was the reason why Peter said they should be baptized. See Acts 10:44,45; also 11:15."

All this had a stunning effect on the Doctor. He perceived that all were convinced that he was wrong and Mabel was right; and he began to turn and twist as if he already anticipated defeat. He rallied his sinking courage, however, and said, with some show of boldness:

"Well, I do not care particularly about these two points; but one thing you have admitted and must admit, namely, that baptism is for the remission of sins."

"That is correct," responded Mabel; "it is here said that baptism is for remission. Now let us learn what it means.

Dr. Stanly says *for* signifies in order to; I deny it and say it signifies *because*."

"Well, bring up your proof," said the Doctor. "I think you will have a burdensome task, if you undertake to prove that *for* means *because* of. All can see it means in order to."

"How did you learn it?" inquired Mabel. "What dictionary tells you that *for* means in order to? For my part I know no such dictionary. Webster, Worcester, Home, Tooke, Craig, and Cobb know nothing of in order to as a meaning of *for*. We are told there are dictionaries that give in

order to as a remote meaning of for; but if the dictionaries are to be relied on at all then the primary meaning of for is because of and not in order to."

"Doctor," inquired Mr. Tibbs, "can you tell us of a dictionary that gives in order to as the primary meaning of for?"

"N-no," hesitatingly replied the Doctor, "but I am sure it means that."

"You are a better lexicographer than Webster or Worcester," added Mr. Tibbs, laconically.

The Doctor blushed but did not reply.

"I wish all to note the fact," said Mabel, "that this is the rock on which the late reformation is built.

The whole superstructure of Campbellism rests on the supposition that for means in order to. If for does not mean that, Campbellism stands; if it happens to mean something else, Campbellism is built on a falsehood!

That this is a fact has been proven by the dictionaries that define for to mean because of.

Mr. J. B. Moody, in defining the English preposition for, asks, "What was the first Baptist beheaded for? For the reproof he gave Herod, that being the cause or occasion, which is the very opposite of 'in order to.' He was not killed in order that he might reprove Herod. What did Baptists in past ages suffer and die for? Answer: For the gospel's sake, that being the cause or occasion, not the prospective design.

What was the man hung for? For murder; not in order to, but the very reverse. What did he laugh for? For joy, that being the cause. What did he cry for? For sorrow, that being the cause. These illustrations of the use and meaning of for show very conclusively it means because of."

"I do not wish it any plainer," said Mr. Tibbs.

"Now let it be remembered," added Mabel, "that the Greek word, *eis*, that is translated 'for' in Acts 2:38, is translated by other English words in other portions of the Scriptures. The word *eis* is said to occur 1,700 times in the New Testament. Mr. Anderson, who translated the New Testament for the Doctor's denomination, translates *eis* 'in order to' twenty times. He translates it thus oftener than any other man. But there were 1,680 times he did not so translate it.

Mr. Campbell translates it 'in order to' *four* times - 4 to 1,696. The Bible Union has 2 to 1,698. Doddridge I to 1,699. King James translates it 48 different ways, but never '*In order to.*' The Oxford Revision has no 'in order to'; Wesley has none; Sharpe has none; Sawyer has none. For these facts I am indebted to Dr. J. B. Moody. They show that where there are a dozen probabilities that *eis* means in order to, there are nearly 1,700 that it does not. What folly then to build up a great system of theology, that upsets other well-authenticated systems, on such a slim and uncertain foundation! See Nashville Debate, p.269.

"That argument," said Mr. Tibbs, "is a home thrust at the life of our denomination."

"That's so, sure," said Bro. Jones.

"Now," continued Mabel, "let us examine the word in some places where it follows baptize as it does here:

'I indeed baptize you with water unto (eis) repentance' (Matthew 3:11). Now does *eis* signify in order to here? Doctor, do you baptize persons who have not repented and in order to repentance?

What! baptize in order that they may repent? No, I know you do not - you will not admit this. And yet as the same two words are used here, and in the same order and to express the same thing, namely, the design of baptism, that are used in Acts 2:38, to be candid and deal fairly, you must baptize in order to repentance, if you will persist in baptizing in order to remission.

I leave the audience to say if this is correct or not."

"It is as clear as sunshine to my mind," said Arthur.

"Miss Clement's conclusion is unavoidable," added Mr. Tibbs. "It is not worth while to waste time and ammunition trying to demolish her intrenchments, for they are utterly impregnable."

"That's so," added Bro. Jones, "that's so, sure."

The Doctor bit his lip, wiped the perspiration from his brow, drank a goblet of water and moved uneasily in his chair. The spectacled man, as usual, went into an ecstasy. All the leading Campbellites looked at the Doctor and at each other in blank astonishment.

"Now let me tell the Doctor another thing he must do, or give up his theory," said Mabel; "he must bury persons in order to kill them,"

This created a ripple of humor at the Doctor's expense and made his cheeks tinge with indignation.

"Baptism," continued Mabel, "is termed a burial; and we are said to be baptized, i. e., buried with CHRIST into death - **'buried... into death'** (Romans 6:3, 4).

Now substitute the Doctor's in order to in the place of into, and what do we have? Baptized in order to death! Burying people to kill them! But we do not bury persons in order to kill them, but because they are dead. So we baptize persons, not to kill them to sin, but because they are already dead to sin and freed from it. Romans 6:2-8; Colossians 2:20; 3:3; I Peter 2:24,"

"Why are they raised up in baptism?" inquired Mr. Tibbs.

"We bury them because they are dead to sin and raise them up because they are alive to GOD, to righteousness (I Peter 2:24), to CHRIST. **'He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him which died for them, and rose again'** (II

Corinthians 5:15). Hence Paul says we who are raised up in baptism '**should walk in newness of life.**'" That was Mabel's answer.

"That is all clear and satisfactory," said Mr. Tibbs. "I accept it as the truth."

The tide was flowing one way so strongly that the Doctor did not seem inclined to try to stop it, or stem the current. He was learning by experience to be quiet.

"In closing this argument," said Mabel, "I wish to say that I believe there should be a uniform translation of these and other passages.

Instead of the Greek preposition, when it follows baptize, being translated by into, unto, in and for, there should be only one preposition used in English. This is what many scholars say and reason confirms what they say. When there is only one preposition in the Greek, why use four in the English? Where baptize and *eis* come together, and are used to express the design of baptism, undoubtedly they should be translated into English in the same way."

"I can see," said Arthur, "we should have a uniform translation wherever the two words are used to point out the design of baptism. This is unavoidable."

"Mr. Campbell," continued Mabel, "says the correct rendering of *eis* is into. Doubtless he is correct, and he and others tell us that *eis* is more than five times to one rendered into.

Now let us put these passages side by side with this translation. It matters not whether it be for, or in, or unto, or into: it all comes to the same in my argument. Here they are. '**Baptize... [into] repentance**' (Matthew 3:11). '**Baptized... [into] the remission of sins**' (Acts 2:38). '**Baptized into... death**' (Romans 6:3).

Now all can see that, if baptism procures remission, it also procures repentance and death. There is no way to avoid this. If there is a loophole to wriggle out of this conclusion, I am too blind to see it."

"You are most assuredly correct," said Mr. Tibbs; "you have made the matter clear beyond the shadow of a reasonable doubt. No honest jury would fail to render a verdict in your favor. It is now as plain to my mind that, if baptism is in order to remission, it is also in order to repentance and death, as it is that two and two make four."

"Baptism," added Arthur, "is either procurative or celebrative. To say it is procurative, we have seen, is simply ridiculous. Therefore it must be celebrative."

"Another thing that strengthens - if it be possible to make stronger - this position is the fact that this language was spoken to Jews," said Mabel. "This language and that spoken by Ananias to Saul were both addressed to Jews. They understood it. They understood this language to signify that baptism is to set forth the fact of remission.

The Gentiles might have misconstrued this mode of expression; hence this phraseology was not used in speaking to them. But this style, this peculiarity of diction, is strictly in accordance with

Jewish phraseology.

In Leviticus, chapter 14, we have the law of the leper in the day of his cleansing: **'The priest shall look, and, behold, if the plague of leprosy be healed in the leper; then shall the priest command to take for him that is to be cleansed two birds, etc.'** Here we find that nothing is to be done unless the leper is healed.

If he is healed, certain things are to be offered for his cleansing - his formal cleansing, of course.

This doctrine is beautifully illustrated by the account of the leper that came to JESUS, knelt down and besought Him, saying: **'If Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean. Jesus... saith..., I will; be thou clean. And as soon as He had spoken, immediately the leprosy departed from him, and he was cleansed.'** Then JESUS said to him, **'go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing those things which Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.'**

Notice this leper was first cleansed; then he was commanded to offer for his cleansing.

What does this mean? Was he yet to procure cleansing? No; that was already procured. He understood all Jews understood it. What he offered for his cleansing was to be a testimony unto the people that he was cleansed of the leprosy. So the Jews understood Peter on the day of Pentecost. I flatter myself that this will help to clarify this subject so greatly mystified to the minds of some people."

"Your position holds good and the opposite theory is too thin to hold water," said Mr. Tibbs, who was being swept off the sandy foundation of Campbellism by this doctrine which was entirely new in Sterling.

"It seems amply sufficient," added Mabel; "but allow me to say in conclusion, that since baptism is either procurative or celebrative, and since it cannot be procurative, as the only one fit to be baptized is pardoned, justified, saved, adopted and has eternal life; therefore baptism is celebrative."

"Well, every night this subject is made clearer and clearer," chimed Bro. Jones.

"And every night it is more evident that we are all wrong and the Baptists are right," added Arthur.

"I deny that statement emphatically," said the Doctor. He was piqued and gave vent to his pent up feelings, as he went on vehemently: "I must say the people of Sterling are too much like the Athenians, who were forever seeking after some new thing.

Anything that has on it the gloss of novelty will catch all Sterling.

The whole town takes after every untried, new-fangled, mushroom doctrine advocated. It is simply silly to believe every new doctrine that comes around; we should not be blown about by every wind of doctrine."

"I must say you are hard on your people," said Arthur; "but the world is progressing, - progress is our watch-word. The trend of the age is onward and upward of better things. Advancement is made in every department of Art, Literature and Science. And why not also have better knowledge of the Scriptures and thus advance in the translation and interpretation of the Bible as well as other things? I can see no reasonable objection to this doctrine because it is new."

"The basis of the Doctor's objection has no existence, in fact, anyway," added Mabel. "He takes it for granted that this is a new doctrine, whereas it has stood the test of over 1,800 years."

True, this doctrine is new in Sterling; but there have been Baptists in all ages of the world since CHRIST, and there are millions in the world today, some being found in almost every part of the globe that is habitable. It is the Doctor's doctrine that is new! Campbellism numbers only about 75 years."

The nail was set in a sure place and clinched. The company then adjourned.

When Jeems and his company struck the pavement, Jeems was striding homeward with an astonishing pace. His short wife had to run to keep at his side. This was unusual. He ordinarily walked with languid deliberation, a habit acquired because retarded by his wee wife, who most always accompanied him, they not being blessed with any encumbrances to keep her at home. But tonight Jeems walked so that no pedestrian in Sterling could outstrip him. What did it mean? Why, Jeems had so much of the Campbellism shaken out of him that he did not know how to meet the arguments and was hurrying along to prevent being questioned. But he had not gone far before George was posting at his side with the inquiry:

"What's your hurry, Mr. Morgan?"

"O, nuthin', nuthin'; only it's gettin' late, George, and time for honest people to be in bed."

"What's your opinion of the diskussion" --

"George," interrupted Jeems, who desired to parry all such questions as this, "did you ubserve that long, lean, lank, lubberly, cadaverous ape of a feller that set in the corner?"

"Yes, I seed him," said George.

"Well, George," continued Jeems, "I take it that feller has got more jints in his bones than anyone I ever met. Why, George, he'll bend anywhere and in any direction, - upward, downward, backward, forward, inward, outward, and, if there's any other way, you may count on him, sure. If I was a bettin' man and not a Chrischun, I'd bet my bottom dollar he's a furriner."

"He's mighty loud and limber - that is to say," replied George.

"I think he could stretch out ten feet long," added Jeems.

"Fur course he could; his nake is full half uv it any day," said Mrs. M., and she waddled on close to the side of her husband, who was all the world to her. As there was a lull here, George tried to

renew his question. He wanted to know how Mr. Morgan stood ere he dared to take a position:
'Mr. Morgan, what's your 'pinion-"

"George," interrupted Jeems, "did you observe his thin, bony hands? Why, the fact is, George, he's as thin as-as-as a ghost. If he'd take his close off, I don't think he'd make a shadder.'

"Fur course not, he's intirely too thin," said Mrs. Morgan added.

"I shouldn't wonder if he's come out uv the grave," Jeems. "People have riz 'afore this, anywise, George."

Here they parted, George wondering if the spectacled man had risen from the dead and watching against ghosts.

Jeems was troubled, but had no idea of yielding one inch of ground.

~ end of chapter 12 ~
