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PREFACE.

On the appearance of a new work, no matter how small, some reasons are generally given for its birth in the literary world. Our task, in this particular, can easily be accomplished. The chapters that compose this work were nearly all published in the Nashville Christian Advocate, this year, and dedicated to "Hinda," the personage to whom it is now inscribed, who was once under the bonds of exclusive immersion, from the influence of habit and education, but who is now a strict believer in the Scriptural doctrine of affusion in baptism. When these chapters were being written, during stolen moments from a laborious itinerant life, the writer had no idea that he would be called on to give them in book form to the world. This unexpected call, however, has been made, and a compliance therewith is the only direct reason we have to give for the publication of the work.

As we are now out in a Preface, we remark here, that our design, when writing these chapters, was to embrace all the great principles contained in lexicons, in the Scriptures, in the writings of the fathers, and in church history, bearing on the question of baptism and its subject; and to present them in a condensed, simple form, easily to be read and comprehended by all. Whether we have succeeded, the reader must decide.

The work, as it now stands, is free from two extremes—neither having too much Greek, nor too much English in its texture. This we lay great stress on; for the thinking mind must feel with us, that a work wholly immersed in English, or too much sprinkled with Greek, cannot meet the demands of the age. In this capacity, it can reach every day wants, and at the same time represent the learned productions, of which, in many respects, it is but a reflection.

Should our language at any point appear severe, and too pointed, the reader will please consider that we are contending against stubborn errors, in print, and chronic diseases of an intellectual nature, that cannot be checked by either soft words or Christian forbearance, the history of the past and of the present testifying. The old man of the fables had to exchange grass for rocks. The moral is ours in practice. Causes must be adequate to accomplish the intended ends. This is our position, and our plea for every line of the work.
But stay a little, gentle reader, that we may talk with you, and prepare your mind for the perusal of this small volume. Just walk down to the river, and there you will see a man, called a Baptist minister, with uplifted hands; and hear him vow before earth and heaven, "All learned men say, that immersion is the proper mode of baptism, and that it only was practiced in the days of the apostles." Is not this sufficient to make the spirit of a Quaker feel warlike? In view of this and kindred statements, when composing the materials of this volume, we thought on the cancer and over the remedy, and the result of our labor was, to use the knife, instead of a soothing plaster.

In bringing this Preface to a close, we would wish it to be distinctly understood, that every sentence, proof, contrast, application and re-application of evidence, throughout the entire work, ought to be regarded, wholly regarded, as the results of design, on our part, and not of accident. Error is opposed with facts, fiction with sober reality, misstatements with the truths of history, opinions with well established authority, examples from the classics with examples from the classics, words and sounds with the plain teachings of inspiration, making, on the whole, these points unmistakably clear, that Baptist authors cannot be relied on, when writing on immersion and its claims—that the figure in John's baptism looked to the descent of the Spirit, and not to the burial and resurrection of Christ—that John did not baptize in water, but with water—that all of the apostles, if they baptized as John did, baptized by affusion—that infants are proper Scriptural subjects for baptism, and that affusion is the only plain mode taught in the New Testament.

With good wishes for the spread of truth, all is most respectfully submitted to the reader.
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A PLAIN WORK ON BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

ERRORS OF BAPTIST AUTHORS.

We advertise our readers that we shall talk pointedly and plainly, calling things by significant terms, throughout a series of chapters that lie before us in contemplation. Would not justice forbid any other course, in view of the fact, that the energies of immersionists are enlisted to the work of proselyting? Are not our people told that they ought to be immersed—sprinkling being only a "rantism," not a baptism? When one is proselyted by misrepresentations of the fathers, and the history of the church, are we not called on to read the result in Baptist papers, as a triumph of truth? In short, as long as this state of things will exist, we shall deem it due to the cause of truth to present the false positions, theories, and assertions of immersionists, and expose their errors. They frankly inform us in their journals, that "the time is at hand" when they will "give no quarters to Pedi- ism," nor to its advocates, but will urge on the water-warfare throughout the length and breadth of this land of light and liberty. We have concluded to present to our young ministers, who may not have time nor opportunities to study the history of the proceedings of immersionists, some facts which will enable them to stand equipped for the war, and to rout those devotees of water from their supposed strongholds, causing them to feel shame and confusion of face. In doing this we shall collect, in
the first place, a number of statements, showing the
gross impositions practiced on the public mind by
the advocates of the doctrine of exclusive immer-
sion.

Their commentators, translators, writers, and his-
torians, are either remarkably ignorant, or willfully
and knowingly pervert sacred things in order to
spread abroad their heartless system of religion.
This is a grave charge, and when the facts are
carefully examined by our readers, they can judge
whether or not we sustain it.

In a work entitled the "Baptist Library—three
volumes in one," we have this notable falsehood:
"German Testament, Matt. iii, 1: In those days
came Johannes der Taüfer—John the Dipper." Now,
we have carefully examined the German Tes-
tament, and German Lexicon, and find that Johan-
nes der Taüfer, taken as a phrase, is neither more
nor less than John the Baptist, or John the Baptiz-
er—the same as in the English version; neverthe-
less, in what immersionists call "standard Baptist
works," this barefaced untruth is packed on the
reading public as a matter of fact.

In this work, page 359, we have this remarkable
discovery and news: "John also was immersed in
Enon, near to Salem, because there was much wa-
ter there; and they came and were immersed." On
reading this passage, we doubted our eyesight,
and paused, reading, and re-reading, before we could
be satisfied that it was so, or that any people in
their sober senses would send forth such a declara-
tion to the world. Pray, who immersed John in
Enon? We can conceive of a person being immersed
in water, but it does bewilder our thoughts to think
on the immersion of John in Enon—yes, Enon.
Well, we live to learn, and if an untruth can make
us wiser, and add to our stock of knowledge, we
bow our heads before immersionists, and thank
them for the information. John was immersed in Enon. What a discovery! The exact spot of John’s baptism had been long unknown to the world, but the fact is now before us, if we believe immersionists—Enon. This is decidedly a rich thought in its own way. John was also immersed in Enon. Reader, forget not this!

In this work, page 8, we read: “The first instance on record, of pouring or sprinkling, is that of Novatian, in the year 251.” Another untruth, plain, and positive. We find in Pond’s work, p. 45, that Walker, a writer of great caution and research, gives us to understand that some 60 years after the death of the apostles a man was traveling in the desert—took sick—desired baptism—was baptized by having sand thrice sprinkled on him, there being no water at hand. Now, when this case was reported to the bishop, after he had recovered, the bishop decided he would have been baptized, “If only water were poured on him.” Irenæus, 67 years after the age of the apostles, mentions the fact, that Christians baptized by affusion. We could here show the priority of affusion before any positive record of immersion, but this would not be in accordance with our present design, which is to convict immersionists of misrepresentation, and to show that they cannot be relied on when the cause of water is at stake. In a future chapter we shall attend to this. We think we are succeeding so well with our charge, that it would be exceedingly wrong to turn for a moment from it. Don’t facts begin so to speak?

In this work, page 13, we read: “Among such a people lived Fidus, the first on record who proposed the baptism of infants.” How ridiculous a falsehood this is! If a house mouse were to get a fair trial for its life, on a supposed misdemeanor, the testimony of such a writer ought not to be re-

\[Irenæus\] does not mention baptism

Wallach 12, vol. 1.
ceived. The truth is, Fidus, an African Bishop, applied to Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, to know, not whether infants ought to be baptized, but whether their baptism might take place before the eighth day after their birth, this being the day on which circumcision was performed. This question was considered in an African Synod, held A. D. 254, at which sixty-six bishops were present; and "it was unanimously decreed, that it was not necessary to defer baptism to that day; and that the grace of God, or baptism, should be given to all, and especially to infants." This decision was communicated in a letter from Cyprian to Fidus, and is made a portion of the history of the church. An immersionist, however, in the face of these indisputable records, asserts that "Fidus was the first on record that proposed infant baptism." Fidus proposed no such thing. He simply inquired as to the time of the baptism of infants—some thinking it ought to take place on the eighth day of their life, answering to the time of circumcision. If a man were trying to frame an untruth, he could not transcend the one before us concerning Fidus. Perhaps we ought to use the term ignorance, instead of falsehood or untruth. Immersionists may take their choice. The matter will be equally the same to us, and to our cause, which is that of truth, and of history. How light makes manifest the works of error!

But these are only samples from this book—a "standard Baptist work," which is destined to hand down to their children falsehoods to believe, assert, and practice.

Let us now notice a statement of A. Campbell, the guiding star of a baptized system of infidelity, palmed off on the public for ancient Christianity restored. Here it is, as found in his debate with Rice, page 260: "Clinics, or unimmersed persons, were inhibited holy orders, by the twelfth canon of
the council of Neocæsarea, and consequently, were ineligible to sacerdotal functions.” Now let us have the decision of the council of Neocæsarea, and we shall see that it is a happy circumstance that water can wash away sins. This is the language of that council: “He that is baptized when he is sick, ought not to be made a priest, for his coming to the faith is not voluntary but from necessity, unless his diligence and faith do prove commendable, or the scarcity of men fit for the office do require it.” The reader will at once perceive that the baptism by affusion, when sick, was not made the ground of the action of the council, but the coming to the faith from the necessity of circumstances, which occasioned doubt as it regarded the genuineness of his piety; yet, A. Campbell would impress the hearer or reader with the thought, that being baptized by affusion was the great point at issue. What a pity that the advocates of immersion do not try to tell the truth! This may be taken as a fair sample of Campbell’s writings and sayings, as we have not time nor space to present other statements of a similar character.

We shall now pay our respects to Jones, the Baptist Historian. In speaking of the Waldenses he says: “On their return”—that is, those who went to inspect matters among the Waldenses—“they reported that they had visited all the parishes where they dwelt, had inspected their places of worship, but that they had found there no images, nor signs of the ornaments belonging to the mass, nor any of the ceremonies of the Romish Church; much less could they discover any traces of those crimes with which they were charged. On the contrary they had kept the Sabbath day, observed the ordinance of baptism according to the primitive church, instructed their children in the articles of the Christian faith, and commandments of God.”
We shall now hear their own historian Perrin, who speaks thus, in Book 1, chap. 6, pp. 30, 31: "King Lewis XII. having been informed by the enemies of the Waldenses, dwelling in Provence, of many grievous crimes which were imposed [charged] upon them, sent to make inquisition in those places, the Lord Adam Fumee, Maister of requests, and a doctor of Sorbon, called Parne, who was his confessor. They visited all the parishes and temples, and found neither images, nor so much as the least show of any ornaments belonging to their masses and ceremonies of the Church of Rome, much less any such crimes as were imposed [charged] upon them; but rather that they kept their Sabbaths duly, causing their children to be baptized according to the order of the primitive church, teaching them the articles of the Christian faith and the commandments of God."

The attention of the reader is particularly invited to that portion of the account given by Jones concerning the children of the Waldenses; and then to Perrin's account. We do not recollect ever meeting with so deliberate a misrepresentation of a fact in the whole course of our life.

Jones entirely omits the baptism of their children according to the usage of the primitive church—the very thing that Perrin, their own historian, labors to establish. Ought not men of honor and truth to be ashamed of a cause that has to be bolstered up by slandering the very ashes of the dead? If Jones intended to convey the idea that the Waldenses observed in their acts towards their children the usage of the primitive church, he then admitted all we contend for, the baptism of infants in primitive times; but, if he did not, he intended to palm off a positive, and deliberate misrepresentation on his readers. Is not this evident?

Our readers, in looking over this chapter of ex-
posure, will please notice the propensity of immersionists to take from, and to add to, when the cause of dipping can be subserved thereby. We have read their works, and carefully noted their statements, and compared them with facts in the face of impartial history, and have been compelled, when baptism is at issue with their views, to doubt every thing that comes from their pens. Have we not sufficient ground for this?

From the examples before us, and these are but items out of countless numbers to us, we think we have not only sustained the charge we made at the outset, but are justified in doubting all their statements, apart from other and better authority. Facts respond yes, both loud and long, and fully uphold our views!

CHAPTER II.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

In our last we made it appear that immersionists are very much addicted to walk in the path of misrepresentation, and on this point we are not done with them yet.

Dr. Gill, in his Dissertation on Jewish Proselyte Baptism, asserts that "there is no mention made of any rite or custom of admitting Jewish proselytes by baptism, in any writings or records before the time of John the Baptist, Christ, and his Apostles; nor in any age after them, for the first three or four hundred years; or, however, before the writing of the Talmuds."

Now, let us see if we cannot prove this statement totally at war with truth in every particular. Maimonides says: "In all ages, when a heathen,
or a stranger by nation, was willing to enter into the covenant of Israel, and gather himself under the wings of the majesty of God, and take upon himself the yoke of the law, he must be first circumcised, and secondly baptized, and thirdly bring a sacrifice; or if the party were a woman, then she must be baptized, and secondly bring a sacrifice. At this present time, when, the temple being destroyed, there is no sacrificing, a stranger must be first circumcised, and secondly baptized.” Maimonides was the great interpreter of the Jewish law.

This truth was not confined to the Jewish nation, but was known among heathens. Epictitus speaks thus: “Why do you pretend to be a Greek, when you are a Jew, a Syrian, an Egyptian? And when we see any one wavering, we are wont to say, this is not a Jew, but acts one. But when he assumes the sentiments of one who hath been baptized and circumcised, then he both really is, and is called a Jew. Thus we falsify our profession, are Jews in name, but in reality are something else.”

Proselyte baptism was so well known among the heathen of Greece and Italy, that it furnished this philosopher with a principle to make a comparison, by censuring those who assumed the profession of philosophy, and failed to act it out. Epictitus is placed by Dr. Lardner, A. D. 109, and by Le Clerc, A. D. 104; still, the Doctor above mentioned, the advocate for immersion, and only believers’ baptism, could find no trace of proselyte baptism, nor record of it, for three or four hundred years after the Apostles. And is this the way immersionists support their cause? Certainly—though not highly respectful to truth. From the time Epictitus wrote, if it were material to the question, we might say that his knowledge of proselyte baptism embraced the time of the Apostles, which of itself
would show how untrue the declaration of Gill is. Watson, in speaking on this subject, says: "This baptism of proselytes, as Lightfoot has fully shown, was a baptism of families, and comprehended their infant children; and the rite was a symbol of their being washed from the pollutions of idolatry." Here is the secret—O yes—here is the very secret of the opposition of the immersing family to proselyte baptism—the children were baptized too. But then they ought not to make a false statement to prop up the altar of their Diana. This is the point, and this is the charge. How guilty!

We could produce much authority here, but one more must suffice. Dr. Wall says: "Wherever Gentiles were proselyted to the Jewish religion, they were initiated by circumcision, the offering of sacrifice, and baptism. They were all baptized, males and females, adults and infants. This was their constant practice, from the time of Moses to that of our Savior, and from that period to the present day."

Well, well, in the face of these facts, Dr. Gill would assert, in trying to support the unsupportable cause of the immersionist, that proselyte baptism was not mentioned, nor placed in any record, for the first three or four hundred years. If infants had been excluded from this proselyte baptism, there is not a Baptist in the land that would not have long since made the discovery, and seen the matter running clearly back to the days of Moses; but as the affair comes to us with infants about it, this alters the case, and to deny the whole, if possible, is found to be the better policy, though it has to be done at the expense of well established facts.

We shall now turn our attention to Booth, a far-famed Baptist writer. Booth, in seeing the difficulty in which his book would place him on the question of positive ordinances, meets the sacra-
ment of the Lord's supper thus: "Does not Paul, when he says, Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat, enjoin a reception of the sacred supper? Does not the term *anthropos*, there used, often stand as a name of our species, without regard to sex? When the sexes are distinguished and opposed, the word for man is not *anthropos*, but *aneer*." This is a most perplexing matter to Baptists, as we shall clearly see in some future chapter. Booth makes a flourish of trumpets, and then ventures so far as to say, by way of interrogatory, that the term *anthropos* often stands as a name for our species. Now, if this were all, a retreat could be made; but this will not satisfy; he must venture something stronger, or give up his whole labor on baptism as a positive ordinance. He is not the man to back out, and leave immersion ruined by his own arguments, for the want of a thus saith the Lord in admitting woman to partake thereof. He ventures the assertion, but it is false, that when the sexes are distinguished and opposed, the word for man is not *anthropos*, but *aneer*. We said this statement is untrue—and now for the proof. In Genesis ii, 24, we read: "Therefore shall a man [*anthropos*] leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife." In Genesis xxxiv, 14, we read: "And Simeon and Levi, the brethren of Dinah, said, We cannot do this thing, to give our sister to one [*anthropo*] that is uncircumcised." In Genesis xxvi, 11, we read: "And Abimelech charged all the people, saying, he that toucheth this man [*anthropou*] or his wife, shall surely be put to death." In Deuteronomy xx, 7, we read: "And what man [*anthropou*] is there that hath betrothed a wife, and hath not taken her?" In Deuteronomy xviii, 5, we read: "Then shalt thou bring forth that man [*anthropos*] or that woman." In Jeremiah xlv, 7, we read: "Wherefore commit ye this great evil against
your souls, to cut off from you man [anthropou] and
woman, child and suckling." In Matthew xix, 10,
we read: "His disciples say unto him, If the case
of the man [anthropou] be so with his wife, it is not
good to marry." In Matthew xix, 3, we read:—
"The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him,
and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man [an-
thropo] to put away his wife for every cause?" In
Mark x, 7, we read: "For this cause shall a man
[anthropos] leave his father and mother, and cleave
to his wife." And in Revelation ix, 7, 8, we read:
"And their faces were as the faces of men [anthro-
poon;] and they had hair as the hair of women." Alas! alas! for the cause of truth, when such a
man as Booth, in laboring to establish a divine
warrant for female communion, in order to make
his arguments on baptism plausible, would assert
that aneer, and not anthropos, is the term used to
designate man from woman.

In view of all the instances before us, we are
prepared to pronounce his statement a most re-
markable production of ignorance, or a Jesuitical
misrepresentation. Is not this so?

In supporting the theory of immersion, Booth
gives us the above for an explicit warrant for a
woman having a right to partake of the Lord's
supper; but it turns out to be an explicit untruth.

This chapter closes our remarks on the perver-
sions and fearful misstatements of immersionists.
The reader can now form his own opinion, as it
regards what confidence ought to be placed in any
declaration that may be made, or has been made,
by an immersionist, when defending a cause that
bears on its very face self-contradiction, and stands
forth before our minds in the true garb of the Phar-
isee, asking every unimmersed minister, "Why
baptizeth thou then?"

Immersionists are willing to compromise the ben-
"
efits of Christ's death with us—to admit that we are partakers of the spirit of holiness—shall commune with the redeemed above; still—still they will place the flaming sword of restriction around the interests that water is designed to protect, lest the rantist might eat, live, and be one with them.

The fundamentals of religion are passed over in their great zeal for water. These, in their plans, policies, and operations, only seem to be secondary considerations. Tracts, pamphlets, and even almanacs, teem with water arguments; but if the word holiness be in them, it is there by accident, not design—water—water being the magnet of attraction. Would that the tender mercies of charity could pass over these things! But we are compelled to expose the rottenness of exclusive immersion by reason of the conduct of its advocates toward the wise and holy of this age, and of the ages past.

But after all, and amid all, those who are proselyted by such implements as these two chapters expose, have our unmeasured pity. There was a time when Jesuits made a departure from facts a virtue, if their cause could thereby be subserved. We have nearly fallen on alike times. Selah. It is said that this word was a sign to Israel's singers to return and repeat the Psalm in song. The reader will please apply the idea here.
CHAPTER III.
THE DESIGN OF BAPTISM.

Amid the feverish controversies that abound on the mode of baptism, and on the proper subject of this ordinance, the design of the matter is partially lost sight of, though it is of greater importance to the faith and practice of the church than either the subject or the mode, inasmuch as both will perish together, unless the design be experienced. We would, in view of this conviction, prefer to occupy many chapters on the design of baptism, instead of one, only for the fact, that the public mind is diverted to the mode and subject, leaving us no opening for choice in the premises. We must, therefore, follow the tide of thought, doing the work needed under present circumstances.

The design of baptism now claims our attention; and for it, beforehand, we claim the serious attention of the reader—we mean that which baptism is a figure of.

Baptism as a figure. It is well known that immersionists contend that baptism is a figure of the burial and resurrection of Christ; but against this view, we shall place the understanding of the disciples during the stay of the Savior on the earth. Now, if we make it appear that the disciples had no such understanding, will it not follow that the introduction of baptism by immersion was an invention that must have taken place after the resurrection of the Savior?

Luke xviii, 33: “And they shall scourge him, and put him to death: and the third day he shall rise again.” In the next verse we are informed: “And they understood none of these things.” Here we are emphatically told that the disciples did not
understand his resurrection. How then could they have baptized, looking on baptism as a figure of his resurrection? We know that they baptized, and from the light of these quotations we also know that they did not use baptism as a representation of that which inspiration says they did not understand; hence immersonists do err, greatly err, when they state that baptism was used by John, and the disciples of the Savior, to set forth a burial and resurrection. Immersionists, from this aspect of the case, cannot support their theory. It stands condemned.

Thomas, after the Savior had risen from the dead, was found an unbelievers in his resurrection. Now, if John had taught, in any manner, baptism to be a figure of the burial and resurrection of the Savior, or if the Savior had so taught his own disciples, would they have been found so profoundly ignorant of the very thing the figure of baptism set forth? Never. The idea of baptism, during the time of Christ's abode on earth, representing his burial and resurrection, is not entitled to the merit of an ingenious invention. It is without the name of a foundation, the Scriptures deciding.

We admit, when immersion was first noted, that those who used it did use it to represent the burial and resurrection of Christ; but as this was a long way from the days of the apostles, and as it had then on its very face the evidence of an invention, in having the candidates naked, and other things equally as foolish and wrong, we are compelled to regard it as without any evidence in the Scriptures to justify its design.

In confirmation of this opinion, that baptism by immersion was introduced as a figure of the burial and resurrection of the Savior, after the apostles had been numbered with the dead, and not previous to this, we here insert some extracts
from the London Baptist Magazine, for February, 1850, p. 84: “The venerable Bede describes Paulinus as baptizing in the Glen, Swale and Trent. Gregory, the very Pope who sent Paulinus, thus speaks of the ordinance: “But we, since we immerse [mergimus] three times, point out the sacrament of the three days’ burial.’” Again: “Forty-six years after Bede’s death, the following canon was passed by Pope Clement: ‘If any bishop or presbyter shall baptize by any other than trine immersion [immersionem] let him be deposed.’” Again: “The writings of Alcuin, born at York, A. D. 735, and educated there by Bishop Egbert, abound in reference to the mode of baptism. In his sixty-ninth epistle he says: ‘Trine immersion [demersio] resembles the three days’ burial.’”

“At the commencement of the 9th century, A. D. 816, a canon was passed at the Synod of Celichyth, to the following effect: ‘Let also the priests know that when they administer holy baptism they pour not holy water on the heads of infants, but always immerse them in the font.’”

From these extracts, taken from an article laboring to establish immersion in the days of the apostles, we are reconfirmed in our conviction, that baptism by immersion was introduced as a figure of the burial and resurrection of the Savior after the death of the apostles; and moreover, that trine immersion did, to the inventors, definitely set forth the three days’ burial of Christ. This, in truth, is the true import of the figure of immersion, as found in the early ages of the church, and handed down to us.

But in trine immersion there is the idea of three resurrections. Ah, this is a serious objection! Where is the figure here? Does not immersion fail at this point, and become inconsistent with itself?
The nakedness of the candidate, which has as much claim to antiquity as immersion, was regarded by immersionists as representing the condition of Christ on the cross. Was this practiced by John, the Savior, and the apostles? There is just as much authority to say so, as to say immersion was. Three immersions—the candidates naked, men, women, and children, were originally found together. To rely, then, on the custom of the early age of the church to prove immersion, is to receive three immersions, the candidates naked, as of apostolic origin; or, to say that the nakedness, and three immersions, were inventions of the fathers, which will open before us a similar right to speak, and to express our conviction, that the whole was a fanciful invention—the immersions, nakedness, and all.

With due respect for the dead, who practiced trine immersion, the candidates naked, and pity for those who take one immersion from them, rejecting the nakedness and other essentials, we would observe that the former were much more consistent with themselves than the latter, inasmuch as the ancient immersionists did not pretend to give Scriptural authority for all their measures, while the modern immersionists pretend to trace the thing back to the days of the apostles—giving, however, no better evidence to the world than one stolen dip, out of the three practiced by their older brethren, in the invention of figure, who laid the foundation for the present unscriptural idea, that baptism was a figure of Christ’s burial and resurrection.

The disciples and John did use baptism as a figure. Proof is ample on this point. We begin with John: “I baptize with water: he shall baptize with the Holy Ghost.” The figure is unmistakable here. It is well supported by the plainest
forms of speech. Luke xxiv, 49: "Behold, I send the promise of the Father upon you." Here is the very thing of which baptism, as used by John, in reference to mode in act, pre-figured. Upon you. Upon you. The promise of the Father, which was the descent of the Holy Ghost, was presented by the Savior in these two significant words—upon you. It would seem, from these words, as if the Savior guarded against the thought of immersion. The baptism of the Spirit, of which John's baptism was a figure in mode, is held up before us by the Savior himself, by an act of coming upon, and not an act of going into, which the design of immersion, in mode, involves. If there were no other terms in the Scriptures bearing on the out-pouring of the Spirit, which John's baptism looked to, but upon you, they would be found sufficient, clearly sufficient, to develop the thing which John's baptism was a figure of. But there are other forms of speech equally as plain. The next in order is one of the same import:

Acts i, 8: "But ye shall receive power, after the Holy Ghost is come upon you." The promise of the Father and the Holy Spirit, as found in these passages, are the same in all points. Upon you. This is sufficient, Luke giving testimony that the Lord, in person, described the manner of this baptism. The words, upon you, should be sounded loud and long, so that the dull ears of immersion might hear, particularly in this case, and become sensible of the force and propriety of language.

Acts ii, 16: "But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; and it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit on all flesh." Here is another exemplification of the thing signified by John's figure in baptism. Can we mistake the mode? No; for the very act that John had spoken of by employing the word
baptize; Peter, by a quotation, calls pouring. Here the word baptize is substituted for the word pour, as it is in Kings for the word wash, leaving its meaning pour, according to a law of language, that substituted words assume the native meanings of the terms which they represent.

Acts ii, 33: "He hath shed forth this, which you now see and hear." This same baptism of the Spirit is now represented by the word shed. Shed, in the mind of Peter, as a word, was sufficient to describe the practical result of what John's figure in baptism looked to. Is not such testimony quite satisfactory?

But again, Acts viii, 16: "That they might receive the Holy Ghost; for as yet he was fallen upon none of them." Fallen upon none of them. Fallen. These words need no comment at this point. They are, of themselves, a comment. Fallen upon.

Acts x, 45: "They of the circumcision were astonished, because on the Gentiles was poured out the Holy Ghost." Titus iii, 6: "The Holy Ghost which he shed on us abundantly." These last two quotations reveal to every order of mind their own signification, and so we might have said of all that precede them; for, how could any enlightened mind, free from bias, misunderstand the mode of the act presented by such terms as upon, pour, shed, fallen upon, poured out?

Baptism, as used by John, had a figure of mode in it; and right here we see what the mode was—pouring out of the Spirit, in the form of affusion, on the disciples and others. How potent our position becomes!

We proved, at the outset of this chapter, that baptism was not understood in the days of John and the disciples, as a figure of Christ's burial and resurrection, which left us to prove what it was a figure of in mode. This we attended to, and the
quotations adduced evidently show that it was a figure of the descent of the Spirit, or baptism of the Spirit, which revealed the doctrine of affusion, and only the doctrine of affusion.

This John understood, in some sense, when he spoke of it; and so we may speak of the disciples; for there was a most accurate knowledge evinced on the first approach of the Spirit, and ever afterward, as it regards mode. Upon, shed, pour, as continually used by the apostles, prove all this, and compel us to say, if they had been trying to employ words to exclude immersion, they could not have selected better terms.

Our conclusion here is, that the mode of baptism practiced by John and the disciples of the Savior, must be regarded as a figure, the design of which, so far as the manner of the act was concerned, was to illustrate the mode of baptism by the Holy Ghost; and that the mode of baptism by the Holy Ghost, of course, illustrates the baptism of John and the disciples, in mode. This cannot be gainsaid but by a perverse mind.

The reader has plain facts now before him, from which he can judge whether John’s baptism was a figure of the burial and resurrection of Christ, or a figure of the baptism of the Holy Ghost.

*The design of baptism as a figure of purification.* It is well known to every Bible reader that the Jewish ablutions had purification for their object. Everything was purified by sprinkling or washing. Baptism, in its spiritual bearing, must be regarded in this light. Neither a small quantity of water, nor a great quantity, can wash away the defilements of sin: still it can, and does, bring up before our minds the thought, that as it washes away spots and stains from the body, so the spiritual washing, which baptism looks to as an ultimate end, purifies the conscience, by washing away sin. Purification
in the soul is what water-baptism teaches; and he that falls short of this, has the shadow, but not the substance,—the sign, but not the thing signified.

In view of these considerations, it must appear to all reflecting minds, that baptism may fitly be regarded as a figure of purification—yea, that this is its leading design.

_Baptism is a visible badge of distinction._ Christianity requires at the hands of a God-honoring people to enter within her sanctuary, and respect her ordinances. Circumcision reminded the Jew that he was in covenant with God. Baptism teaches us the same lesson. If a Jew failed to comply, on his part, with the requirements of the covenant, the fault was his own. If baptized children, or baptized adults, fail, on their parts, to act out the demands of the covenant of grace, the fault is their own—their baptism ought not to be assailed. If a baptized child should refuse to comply with the obligations under which baptism placed the soul, the hour the distinctive badge was put on, the case finds a similar one in the acts of the man who places himself in covenant with his God, in baptism, and then backslides, and lives a life of sin.

Baptism, regarding the previous thoughts, may safely be set down as a badge of distinction, that places the person or persons baptized in covenant relations with God.

_The relation of parents to their children in the design of baptism._ It is a matter of great mortification, that parents but too often forget their relation to their baptized children. In all other matters they evince great solicitude for their happiness, their education, and welfare in life. The relation in which baptism places them to their children, stands out a lone case of exception, when we consult their anxieties for their offspring. Baptism is not a stipulation that involves the acquisition of worldly
honor, fame, wealth—but things of greater value—things of more enduring lustre—things that must exist while God endures, and his throne stands amid the cherubim. The baptized child ought to be informed that it was put into a covenant relation with the God who gave it being, when given to him in holy baptism; and also, that the water which was poured on it in baptism, not only taught the descent of the Spirit, but its cleansing and purifying influence. These lessons ought to be continually kept before the eye of every baptized child—yea, the mother ought to wet these lessons with her tears, while praying that the thing signified, when her child was made a disciple in baptism, might be realized. Were matters thus attended to, the exhortation of the apostle, on behalf of children at Ephesus, would be much better understood than it now is; that is to say: "Bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

To illustrate what we say in reference to children we shall remark, if a piece of clean paper is taken, and a few words written on it with a pen dipped in sweet milk, and then laid by for a time, and again taken up, and placed before heat, every letter will appear, as if written with ink. In like manner will holy baptism, and the above teachings appear, when such children are brought under the influence of the grace of God in revival scenes. Every lesson will then show; and the design of discipleship in baptism will then develop itself in happy, saving results.

This chapter discloses to us these facts, that baptism, as a figure, did not, in the days of John, nor in the days of the disciples, represent the burial and resurrection of Christ, but the descent and purifying influence of the Spirit; and that it is a badge of distinction that places the person in covenant relation with God, and imposes relative duties on
parents toward their baptized children, which involve eternal consequences.

Need we repeat that we make it plainly evident in this chapter that baptism was regarded by John and the apostles as a figure of the descent and purifying influence of the Holy Spirit?

May the solemn truths herein set forth claim the deepest regard and reflection of the reader, so that he may be saved from error in thought and act.

CHAPTER IV.
MODE OF BAPTISM.

As immersionists have recourse to bapto, baptizo, the prepositions en, eis, apo, and ek; when laboring to propagate the exclusive doctrine of dipping in baptism, we shall, in the process of a strict examination, throughout a series of chapters, bearing directly on these terms, show that they do most conclusively coincide with our conviction, that affusion is the only plain mode of baptism presented by inspiration. The lexicons, the Scriptures, and the classics, will be appealed to, and various examples taken therefrom, directly illustrating our position. In view of this, we shall begin with bapto, the father of two families of Greek words, that are interspersed through the Scriptures to express baptisms. The lexicographers will constitute our first authority on the meaning of this term. Scapula defines bapto thus: to immerse, to plunge, to stain, to dye, color, wash. Conlon gives to it this signification: to immerse, to dye, to cleanse. Schrivellius gives this as its import: to dip, to dye, to wash, to draw water. Ursinus gives it this sense: to dip, to dye, to wash, to sprinkle. Don-
negansaysitssignificationis—to dip, to plunge into water, to submerge, to wash, to dye, to color. Jones attaches this import to it: I dip, I stain. Hedericus defines it as follows: to immerse, to plunge, to dye; also to wash. Pasor fixes to it this meaning: to dip, to immerse, to dye. Groves says it signifies—to dip, plunge, immerse, to wash, to wet, moisten, sprinkle, to steep, imbue, to dye. Here we perceive that nine lexicographers give several literal meanings to *bapto*, yea, make sprinkle a literal signification of the word.

Immersionists, however, inform us that it “has only one proper or specific meaning, all other meanings being figurative or tropical.” The reader has the facts before him, to which we invite his careful attention, without comment on our part here, being persuaded that he will come to the conclusion, that either the lexicographers or immersionists are wrong in their expositions on *bapto*; and that it is much more reasonable to believe the former are right, and the latter wrong, than to believe the latter right, and the former wrong. To wash, to sprinkle, constitute the great cause of offense to the faith of the immersionist. Had the lexicographers kept clear of giving wash and sprinkle as literal significations of the term, there would not have been such a propensity on the part of immersionists to place all meanings of the term to the account they have opened for *figure*, except the word *dip*.

But it may be said that immersionists deny the charge above brought against them, that *bapto* has only one literal signification. Those who get behind Dr. Carson may—as he contends and proves, though a rigid immersionist, that *sprinkle* is as literal a meaning of *bapto* as *dip*. But is there any other one of them of notoriety that so writes? Yes, we know of another, the author of “Letters” address-
ed to Bishop Hoadly, who says that it “signifies to sprinkle,” and that it “is not used in the Septua-
gint in one place, where the frequent ceremony of
washing the whole body occurs.” In proof of our
charge we give the following facts. Campbell, their
oracle on the subject of baptism, though, for reasons
of policy, they do not acknowledge it, says: “Where-
ever there is hap, there is dip, in fact or in figure.”
This is not all. Hear him again in unmistakable
language: “It is difficult to conceive how any man
of letters and proper reflection can for a moment
suppose that bapto can ever mean to sprinkle.”
Dr. Gale occupies the same ground. Hear him:
“That bapto when it signifies to dye retains the idea of
dipping.” Again he says: “That when its primary
meaning is not retained, which seems to be to dip, it
has a metaphorical sense.”

Well! well! Has it come to this, that immer-
sionists, in trying to support only dipping in bap-
tism, will express astonishment at the man who can
for a moment suppose that bapto ever means to
sprinkle? Surely it has. This position, be it
remembered, is at war with the lexicons, since they
show that dye, wash, and sprinkle, are as literal
meanings of bapto, as the word dip. If they (im-
mersionists) were to speak honestly here, they
would acknowledge that all lexicographers disagree
with them; and in doing so, they would only be
following up the example of Carson, who candidly
recorded the admission. To attempt to hold on to
the lexicographers, on their part, and say that bapto
has only one literal meaning, dip, is an outrage on
common justice, and a palpable insult to candor
and honesty.

We need not another word to show the pitiable
and condemned attitude of immersionists on the
term bapto: still, for the sake of exposing their
errors, and advocating truth, we shall invite the
attention of the reader to the decision of the water-loving Carson on its literal sense and application. In speaking of the term, when applied to dyeing, he says: "Hippocrates used *bapto* to denote dyeing by dropping the dyeing liquid on the thing dyed. When it drops upon the garments [*baptae*] they are dyed." In looking at this act, he was compelled to admit, and to speak thus: "This surely is not dyeing by dipping!" Again he says: "Nearchus relates that the Indians [*baptontae*] dye their beards;" and then adds: "A word may come to enlarge its meaning, so as to lose sight of its origin. Had it been attended to, Baptists would have found no necessity to prove that *bapto*, when it signifies to dye, always properly signifies to dye by dipping; and their opponents would have seen no advantage from proving that it signifies dyeing in any manner." Hear him again on this word: "*Bapto* signifies to dye by sprinkling, as properly as by dipping, though originally it was confined to the latter. Nor are such applications of the word to be accounted for by metaphor, as Dr. Gale asserts. They are as literal as the primary meaning. It is by extension of literal meaning, and not by figure of any kind, that words come to depart so far from their original signification?"

Dr. Carson, it will be perceived, freely admits that *bapto* does as literally express dyeing by sprinkling, as it does dyeing by dipping: hence we have two modes of dyeing—the first by dipping, and the second by sprinkling.

Now, from all the preceding considerations, we are forced to this conclusion, that Campbell and his hidden and unhidden followers, may continue to express surprise at a man of letters supposing for a moment that *bapto* can ever mean to *sprinkle*, and the followers of Gale give it a metaphorical sense, apart from dipping; still the unprejudiced
mind will unhesitatingly receive the meaning given to it by the lexicons, and supported by Carson as true—that it does as properly and as literally mean to sprinkle as to dip. This decision meets with the approval of the far-famed Dr. Clarke, who says that both baptō and baptizo mean to sprinkle.

A few more examples of the classic use of baptō, before closing this chapter, will be found interesting to the reader. Ælian, when speaking of an old coxcomb, who wanted to appear younger than he was, said, “He endeavored to conceal the hoariness of his hair by dyeing it.” Baphe was the word employed to express the act. Did he dip his hair in the dyeing liquid? Let him believe it that can! He simply applied the liquid to the hair; and by this mode the hair was baptized.

Homer, when speaking of the battle of the frogs and mice, said: “He breathless fell, and the lake was [ebapteto] tinged [or baptized] with blood.” Surely the lake was not dipped in blood! It was simply tinged, or baptized, with blood, not in blood.

Aristophanes, when speaking of Magnes, an old comic actor of Athens, said: “He used Lydian music, shaved his face, and [baptomenos] smeared it over with tawny washes.” Did he baptize his face by dipping it in tawny washes? No, but simply smeared it, or baptized it with, not in, tawny washes.

Aristotle speaks of a substance, saying, “If it is pressed it [baptei] dyes and colors the hand;” or, in other words, that it baptizes the hand with its coloring juice. And is this the way that the parent of baptizo wholly dips everything and person?

The reader will see that we are not contending against the idea of dipping, in some cases where baptō is used, but against the idea of nearly all immersionists, that it does not mean to sprinkle. The proof is satisfactory, that it does; hence we
exclaim, Alas! alas! poor bap! The dip is not general. Sprinkle is found, in fact, as one of the meanings of bapto, and not in figure. So much then for the mode, through this word, from the lexicons, Carson, the classics, Clarke, and the author of letters to Hoadly.

CHAPTER V.
THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

The Scriptural use of bapto now claims our attention. In Lev. xiv, 6: "As for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall [bapser] dip them," that is, in the blood of the slain bird. Let us now turn to the 16th verse of this chapter: "And the priest shall [bapser] dip his right finger in the oil that is in his left hand."

In Daniel iv, 33, we learn: "And his body was [oaphe] wet with the dew of Heaven."

It is useless to collect other examples. These will be found sufficient for our present purpose. In what sense did the priest baptize his finger in the oil? To moisten or smear it, inasmuch as he could not have dipped his finger in the small quantity of oil contained in the hollow of his left hand. If the same quantity of oil had come on his finger out of a vessel, it would have been called a baptism. If we doubt this, look again over the examples given in the 4th chapter, and doubt will at once be removed. Did not a little blood baptize the lake? And did not the substance pressed baptize the hand? Of a truth, our position here will not admit the possibility of denial or dispute.
In what sense did the priest[^bapseï] dip the living bird, the cedar, the scarlet, and the hyssop, in the blood of the slain bird? Simply to slightly wet them, or moisten them, which answered all the design he had in view, which was to do a work of sprinkling. The conclusion on the previous example would apply here.

And in what sense was Nebuchadnezzar [^ebaphe] wet with the dew of heaven? The understanding of the matter would seem thus: he was wet nightly by reason of small particles of water falling on him, moistening him, or sprinkling him—the mode a descent. This baptism clearly sets forth the act of affusion. He was wet with the dew of heaven, that is, baptized with the dew of heaven.

An immersionist may take occasion to enter an objection to our stress on with in the baptism of Nebuchadnezzar, by saying that the original reads *ebaphe apo*, which signify to *wet from*. Very well. Now let us see if an appeal to the original will help immersion. *Ebaphe apo*. That is to say, *baptized from* the dews of heaven. Will this make the case any better for the immersionist? It will not. Whether we say baptized with the dews of heaven, or baptized from the dews of heaven—the idea of immersion is out of the question. If a cloud covered the king as a garment, still immersion was out of the question, as the cloud descended on him—a thing incompatible with immersion, which sets forth the idea of dipping into, and not a coming on. The king was *baptized with* the dews of heaven; that is, *sprinkled with* descending dews, either directly from the clouds, or from the leaves of trees, under which he took shelter.

An immersionist may enter an exception to our views on the baptism of the bird, the cedar, the scarlet, and the hyssop, by saying there was water used with the blood of the slain bird. Now let us
see how much the water will help his cause. Dr. Clarke informs us, according to the statement of the Rabbins, that there was only an egg-shell and a half full of water used with the blood of the slain bird; and of course the living bird, the cedar wood, the scarlet, and the hyssop, could not have been immersed in so small a quantity of water and blood.

Would it not sound strange now to hear a man say that he immersed a living bird, the cedar, the scarlet, and the hyssop, in such a small quantity of blood and water? Remarkably so. These things, as above said, were moistened with the blood and water, that the priest might sprinkle therewith.

And an immersionist may say, objecting to our representation of the priest baptizing his finger in oil, that bapsei apo are employed to express the act. Well, we are apprised of this. Bapsei apo. That is to say, he shall baptize from the oil—moisten, or wet his finger from or with the oil. This is the true sense of the passage. If it were bapsei eis, the immersionist would have some ground to go on; but as the matter stands here, there is not a resting place for the thought of a total immersion.

In view of these baptisms, what is our conviction? It is this: we have the bap, but alas for poor dip!

We shall now proceed to hear what some of the old versions have to say on bapto. The old Syriac version, Rev. xix, 13, reads thus: “And he was clothed with a garment sprinkled with blood.” The Vulgate, translated by Jerome, reads: “He was clothed with a vesture sprinkled with blood.” The Ethiopic reads: “Sprinkled.”

In addition to this Origen, the learned Greek father, in giving the sense of the above passage in the form of a quotation, presented, bebammenon, a participle of bapto, in the garb of errantismenon, a participle from rantizo, which signifies to sprinkle.
This aspect of the case makes so much against the theory of the immersing family, that Dr. Gale supposes there had been a copy of the New Testament which had \textit{rantizo}, where \textit{bapto} ought to have been; and that this led Origen and others into error, and caused the word sprinkle to have a place in their works.

Dr. Carson, though as great a lover of water as Gale, dissents from this view, and remarks: “Misapprehension of the meaning of the passage, it is much more likely, has substituted \textit{errantismenon} for \textit{bebammenon}.”

Dr. Gale, in order to support immersion, ventures the thought, that there was a copy of the Scriptures which did not exactly correspond with the one we now have. Dr. Carson is not disposed to follow Gale here, but asserts that misapprehension caused the introduction of the word \textit{sprinkle}, as a fit representative of \textit{bapto}.

We come now to close our remarks on \textit{bapto}; and in doing so we ask, what are we to think of a cause that has to be propped up by impeaching the knowledge of Origen with misapprehension of a Greek word—by doubting the correctness of the copy of the Scriptures to which he had access—by turning the plain, literal significations of \textit{bapto}, into tropical ones, in defiance of the high authority of the lexicons, and by rejecting the common import of the term, both in the classics and the Scriptures, and receiving and advocating far-fetched and fanciful interpretations? That the cause of immersion is sorely pressed—cannot be sustained; and moreover, that it is as badly founded as Campbell’s idea, “wherever there is \textit{bap}, there is \textit{dip}, in fact or in figure.”

We stand persuaded that we have presented a sufficient array of facts and reasoning to convince every honest mind that \textit{bapto}, the parent of \textit{baptizo},
and the entire family of words that express baptisms, signifies, literally, to sprinkle, to moisten or wet, by bringing things in contact with the fluid, and by bringing the fluid in contact with the person or things. This is sufficient. We want no more. *Bapto* signifies to *sprinkle*.

CHAPTER VI.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Having concluded our last chapter with what we had to say on *bapto*, we are now ready to proceed to the consideration of the darling word of every immersionist—we mean *baptizo*. We shall first, however, hear what the lexicographers have to say on this term. Hedericus.—*Baptizo*—to dip, immerse, to cover with water, to cleanse, to wash; to baptize in a sacred sense. Stephanus.—*Baptizo*—to dip, immerse, to merge, submerge, to cover with water, to cleanse, to wash. Scapula.—*Baptizo*—to dip or immerse, to dye, as we immerse things for the purpose of coloring or washing them; also to plunge, submerge, to cover with water; also to cleanse, to wash. Schleusner.—*Baptizo*—to plunge, immerse, to cleanse, wash, to purify with water. Parkhurst.—*Baptizo*—to immerse in or wash with water, in token of purification. Robinson.—*Baptizo*—to immerse, to sink. In the New Testament to wash, to cleanse by washing; to wash oneself, to bathe, perform ablutions. Schrivellius.—*Baptizo*—to baptize, to immerse, to cleanse, to wash. Groves.—*Baptizo*—to dip, immerse, immerge, plunge; to wash, cleanse, purify; *Baptizomai*—to wash oneself, bathe. Suidas.—*Baptizo*—to sink, plunge, immerse, wet, wash, cleanse, purify. Bretschneider.—*Baptizo*—often to
dip, often to wash, to cleanse. Wahl.—*Baptizo*—to wash, perform ablutions, cleanse; secondly, to immerse. Greenfield.—*Baptizo*—to immerse, submerge, sink; and in the New Testament, to wash, perform ablutions, cleanse, to immerse.

Here we have the definitions of twelve lexicographers. The reader can at once see the number of meanings attached to the term—that it signifies to wash; in any sense, to perform ablutions, in any manner; and to wet, and the like, in any manner.

Let the reader distinctly remember, that lexicons, on the meaning of *baptizo* in the Scriptures, begin with the word wash. See Robinson, as above given. If this very necessary distinction were always made, and the public mind so informed; and that the classic lexicons generally begin with *dip*, sink, plunge, or immerse—giving wash as a literal meaning—the controversy on the mode of baptism might easily be terminated; inasmuch as the Scriptures show that washings were called baptisms by no less than Paul. We said that the controversy on the mode of baptism could easily be brought to an end, if the public mind but knew that the lexicographers, on the Scriptures, give wash as the first meaning of *baptizo*; and that the Scriptures call acts of washings, and of sprinklings, baptisms.

We shall take the significations given to the word by Bretschneider—often to dip, often to wash; that is, that *baptizo* often means to wash, as well as to dip, and prove that the Scriptures exactly agree with the *often to wash*.

Let us turn to Hebrews ix, 10: "Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers [*baptismois*] washings." Let it here be understood, before we turn to the divers baptisms spoken of, that *baptismois* is a noun dative, from *baptizo*. Now, if the acts called baptisms by the apostle, can be made appear to be neither more nor less than washings
and sprinklings, will not the doctrine of exclusive immersion be ruined, while the Scriptures and the lexicons will be found in perfect agreement on the term? The lexicographer before us gives wash, and the translators of our English version gave wash, when setting forth the true sense of baptizo. Were they right in doing so? Is the lexicon before us right? The Scriptures must decide.

Divers baptismos—that is, divers baptisms, rendered in the English version, divers washings. We are compelled to be particular here, in order to show the English reader that the word wash is the same in meaning with baptizo; and that baptizo means to sprinkle, as it speaks through its own form.

These are the baptisms spoken of by the apostle, in Hebrews ix, 10; Exodus xxix, 4: "And Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring to the door of the tabernacle, and [louseis] wash them." Exodus xxx, 19: "For Aaron and his sons shall [nipsetai] wash their hands and feet." Exodus xxx, 20: "When they go into the tabernacle of the congregation, they shall [nipsontai] wash with water." Leviticus xiv, 8: "And he that is to be cleansed, shall [louseis] wash himself in water." Deuteronomy xxxi, 6: "And all the elders of that city shall [nipsontai] wash their hands over the heifer." 2 Chronicles iv, 6: "He made also ten lavers, and put five on the right hand, and five on the left, to [plunein] wash in them: such things as they offered for the burnt offering they [apokluein] washed in them; but the sea was for the priests to [niptesthai] wash in." Leviticus xvi, 14, 15: "And he shall take of the blood of the bullock, and [ranei] sprinkle it with his finger on the mercy-seat eastward, and before the mercy-seat shall he [ranei] sprinkle of the blood with his finger seven times. Then shall he kill the goat of the sin-offering that is for the people, and bring his blood within the vail, and do with that blood as he
did with the blood of the bullock, and \([ranei]\) sprinkled it upon the mercy-seat, and before the mercy-seat." To show that these sprinklings are included in the apostle's use of \(baptismois\), we have only to quote from Hebrews ix, 13, 14: "For if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of a heifer, \(rantizousa\) sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works, to serve the living God." In the 19th verse of this chapter we read: "Moses took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and the people." The only question here is, are these the acts that the apostle calls baptisms? We emphatically say, they are. Moses sprinkled the people. This is called a baptism by Paul. Ah! this is the point. Here we have the use of the \(bap\) to designate it—but where is the \(dip\)? The priest sprinkled the blood before the mercy-seat. Here, too, we have the use of the \(bap\) to designate it, but where is the \(dip\)? Aaron and his sons washed with water. Here again, as well as in all the other cases, we have the \(bap\) employed to embrace the act—but where is the \(dip\)?

Now, do we not prove from these quotations that washings and sprinklings—yea, that acts called sprinklings with blood, and washings with water, by the Holy Spirit, are, in the language of Paul, baptisms—divers \(baptismos\)? The previous acts are the divers baptisms.

We selected one lexicographer who defines \(baptizo\)—often to wash. Does not this definition strikingly harmonize with the translation, divers washings? But when we come to see the meaning exemplified in the Old Testament, and to hear \(baptizo\) speaking through its noun, \(baptismois\), we
find it in reality sprinkling. Let no man then ever say that there is not an act of sprinkling in the Scriptures called a baptism. We named above many that are called washings and sprinklings. Yes—yes, and invite the immersionist to the task of contradiction.

Here we might stop—make a full pause; inasmuch as we have proved by Paul all we advocate, that an act of sprinkling is properly expressed by 

baptizo. But we shall not, until we show every honest mind that exclusive immersion has not the shadow of a foundation in either the Scriptures or the classics.

In the course of chapters yet to be written we shall trace the word through many windings—all of which will be found ruinous to the claims of a total immersion. In bringing this chapter to a close, however, we shall contrast the opinion of immersionists on the word with the definitions of the lexicographers, and the use Paul makes of it. A. Campbell says: "Baptizo is a specific word, and as such, can have but one proper, original, and literal meaning." A man of a tender conscience, of nice modesty, might well blush here. What! The term has but one literal meaning! Do the lexicons say so? Nay, but give many literal meanings. Does Paul's use of it accord with Campbell's position? Nay, but shows the bap, where sprinkling appears.

Carson says: "My position is that it [baptizo] always signifies to dip; never expressing any thing but mode. Now, as I have all the lexicographers and commentators against me in this opinion, it will be necessary to say a word or two with respect to the authority of lexicons." What! all the lexicographers and commentators against the idea, that baptizo has only one meaning! No wonder that the water-chariot rolls on heavily—having to
contend against all the lexicons and commentators. This is a candid confession of Carson. We respect him for it. All the exclusive immersionists ought to do likewise. But after all, is not the position an extraordinary assumption, fearful in its aspect, and alarming in its consequences? If Carson had said that Paul was against him too, he would have only thereby admitted another feature of truth.

Is it not sufficient to make patience bristle, and sense revolt, when we hear immersionists, throughout these lands, assert that the lexicons, and all great men, and the Scriptures, justify their exclusive doctrine of dipping?

Our conclusion is, that all the lexicons and commentators, and Paul too, are against exclusive immersion—Campbell's declaration being a witness, and Carson deciding. And we may here add, tropical meanings also—the great Ernesti being judge; inasmuch as he informs us thus: "The primitive or proper signification, strictly understood, often becomes obsolete. In this case, the secondary sense, which would have been the tropical one, becomes the proper one?"

Amid all, however, let it be kept in mind that the Holy Spirit, speaking through Paul, called acts of sprinklings baptisms. This is the best lexicon, the unerring lexicon, after all, to which every inquirer in the ways of truth must bow, and before which every tongue must be silent.

So much then for baptizo from the lexicons and the Scriptures. The doctrine of springling, is expressed by it in the latter, and a washing with water in the former, which is affusion.
CHAPTER VII.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

In our last we turned the attention of the reader to the various significations of baptizo, as found in the first lexicons; and then to the pleasing fact, that its position in the Scriptures perfectly agrees with the office assigned it by the lexicographers—to wash, which we found, by reference to the Old Testament, to be neither more nor less than the application of water to persons, and the sprinkling of blood. In view of this, we would now stand ready to illustrate the doctrine of affusion in baptism from the classic use of the term, and its use by the Scriptures and the fathers, only for the consideration, that immersionists inform the unlearned and unread that the word ought to have been translated immerse, and would have been so, had King James not prohibited the translators. This, of course, demands our attention here, as we purpose, while sustaining affusion in baptism, to cut off every plea and subterfuge of the immersing family.

To show that this is an error of a most pitiable character, we have only to quote from their own authority. The New York Recorder for 1850, a leading Baptist journal, after making it evident that the word baptize was found in the earliest specimens of English literature, and used among the common people before our early translations, gives to the world this idea: "That any attempt to displace it would have been as futile as an attempt to divide the seas. Immerse during this time was a word unknown to the language; so far as we can discover, its first introduction being as immerge, which is found in Lord Bacon, who lived contemporaneously with King James' translators. Even
in that form, however, it belonged to the schools, and not to the people, and would have been to them wholly unintelligible. They would have said, 'Baptize we know, and dip we know, but what is this immerse that intrudes itself, a stranger and a foreigner, into the language of the household of faith? Away with it, and let us have our baptism back again, that we may read in our own tongue the wonderful works of God!''

Again, this journal says: "We think we have adduced evidence enough to show that the word baptize came as honestly into the language as any other word that the language contains."

Again it says: "In this early morning of our literature, A. D. 1280, the word, so far as we have been able to discover, first occurred in our literature, though with appearance of being already domesticated. From that time we trace it continually, in several works, down to Wickliffe's translation, A. D. 1380, and thence through every succeeding version, and in all our literature of those times."

Now, from this high Baptist authority on the word baptize and its history, are we not prepared to pity the duplicity of all Baptist ministers who assert that it ought to have been translated immerse, and would have been so translated only for kingly interference? The king's translation was made in 1611; and from this high Baptist authority we prove that long before this, and coming up to this, the people would have said, "Away" with the word immersion, "and let us have our baptism back again;" and moreover, that the term baptize came as honestly into our language as any word in it.

How strange that men do not try to find the truth, and then speak it!

The sixth resolution of a meeting held in Oliver
street, New York, this year, reads thus: "Resolved, That the substitution of the word *immerse* for the word *baptize*, in our common version, would be a just occasion of grief and alarm." Now, let those who advocate the word *immerse* instead of the word *baptize*, and complain of the king's translators, turn their attention to a Baptist meeting in New York, the testimony of which is, that *immerse* for *baptize* would be a just occasion of *grief* and *alarm*—not a fanciful occasion, but a just one.

Well, if the king's translators had given the word *immerse* instead of *baptize*, this Baptist authority would have said, and justly too, that such an act was not only contrary to the history of the word, but afforded "a just occasion of grief and alarm." This is enough. Let us then hear no more about not having *immerse* for *baptize*, since this testimony is from the strong places of immersion.

In this connection we shall mention a fact that is not generally known, but which ought to be, that the king's translators were immersionists. Ah! this is a serious matter! Here is a king-cure for complaining Baptists! Let every reader distinctly remember this, and when he hears one of them complaining against the English version, plainly inform him that it was translated by immersionists, and not anti-immersionists. This will be so easily made evident, that we shall only present a short quotation from Campbell's debate with Rice, page 259, deeming it sufficient for our present design, which is not only to prove that the king's translators were immersionists, but to prove it by the testimony of an opponent, which reads thus: "In the work of Floyer, page 50, it is mentioned that the English Church practiced immersion down to the beginning of the 17th century. As confirmation of this, the first Liturgy, in 1547, enjoins a trine immersion in case the child is not sickly." Now, take
the king's translation, made in 1611, and compare its date with these dates, and you will at once see that the translators were immersionists; and moreover, you will be properly prepared to estimate the effrontery of every Baptist minister who either says or writes that the translators favored our views. Every such statement is false. The man who would make it, ought to be ashamed of his ignorance, or repent over his wickedness.

In the quotation before us, the reader will find trine immersion again—the old, fanciful invention, from which the Baptists stole their *dip*; but we shall let this pass by, stating that we have here additional proof of what we said in the third chapter, that immersion was an invention, which was unknown to the days of the apostles.

But in reference to the translation, from the facts before us and the facts that will soon follow, we make bold to say that the translators, in 1611, did what other translators had done before them—simply transferred the word. The truth is, that all who favor affusion in baptism, as the only plain Scriptural doctrine, have to contend against an error that was practiced in the early age of the church, and ushered forth on many generations. Immersion is what we allude to. We find it practiced toward the end of the second century, or beginning of the third—practiced in such a manner, when history speaks, as to make modesty, propriety, and decency blush; and moreover, to impress us with the thought, that such a state of things did not exist in the days of the apostles. The influence of this time-honored custom, nursed by the darkest ages, after having been much modified, and squared to meet the law of decency, hung heavily on the age in which the translators of our present version lived, and thereby placed them in a direct connection with immersion. We repeat, that those who advocate
affusion in baptism, as the only plain Scriptural mode, are the very ones that could reasonably complain against the influence of the error above named on the minds of the translators. Immer- sionists do it with a poor grace—the previous considerarions staring them in the face, and appealing to the world.

The forty-seven translators, under the king, only followed the precedents set by others, much nearer the apostles than they were, which we shall now proceed to show in the most conclusive manner. The translations run as follows, beginning with the Peshito Syriac and the Arabic, works of the highest antiquity, which translate *baptizo* by the term *amad*, which signifies to wash. Schaal's Lexicon defines the word thus: "He washed himself, was washed, stained, immersed in water, was baptised." The Ethiopic version translates by a word which signifies ablution as well as immersion. The Persic to wash, being from the Syriac. The Basmuri transfers the word, as found in our version, also the Sahidic. The German gives the term wash. The Dutch, Danish, and Swedish translations give a similar sense to the word. The Anglo-Saxon version contains a term which means to cleanse. The Geneva Bible, French version, and Italic, Arias Montanus, and Tyndale, give, says Dr. Rice, either a transfer of the word, or translate it by a generic term, signifying to wash, to cleanse. In view of these facts, Dr. Rice well said, "We have nineteen of the most important translations of the Scriptures, not one of which translates *baptizo* by a word definately signifying to immerse."

We shall here add that Jerome—the immersing Jerome—the author of the Latin Vulgate, transferred *baptizo* in every instance, except one; and here he gave wash: "He descended and washed seven times in Jordan." (2 Kings, v, 14.)
Is it not now clearly evident, that the king's translators only did what wise and pure men had done before them? Well, on this account, is it not a great pity that immersionists do not inform themselves from recorded facts, and keep from making statements that are without any foundation in reality?

We are satisfied with our present, beautiful translation of the Scriptures, knowing that it teaches nothing but affusion in baptism, when proper expositions are given. We are perfectly willing to end this controversy with immersionists by its teaching, without any appeal to the original. But this will not suit their views. One moment they teach that immersion is as clearly taught in the Scriptures as repentance and faith; and the next, that the king's translators were wrong in not translating *baptizo* immerse. Such is their policy, and we must meet it; hence the necessity of the proofs and reasoning in this chapter. Let us remember here, distinctly remember, that the translators could have, with great propriety, given the word *baptisms*, where we have washings—the word *baptized*, where we have washed—the word baptize, where we have wash—and the word washed, where we have dipped. The reader can refer to these places in the Scriptures. See Hebrews ix, 10; Luke xi, 38; Mark vii, 4; and 2 Kings v, 14. In the first instance it is *baptismois*—in the second, *ebaptistheo*—in the third, *baptisontai*—and in the fourth, *ebaptisato*. Nor is this all; they could have given us, with equal propriety, *at* Jordan, where we have *in* Jordan—*at* Bethabara, where we have *in* Bethabara—and *at* Enon, where we have *in* Enon; and moreover, *from* the water, where we have *out of* the water—*to* the water, where we have *into* the water—and then *from*, where we have *out of*.

We only mention these things to show that
immersionists ought not to complain of the translation. True, it is fatal to their cause as it stands, but it would have been much more so, had not the translators been under the influence of trine immersion.

A thought or two more before closing. Is it not somewhat remarkable, after all we have heard about following Christ into the water, and then straightway up out of the water, that the Baptist Bible, so called, which was the cause of much trouble to the Baptist Bible Society in New York, has from the water, not out of the water, as found in our version? Is this not a strange affair? Nor is this all. Hear the water-loving Ripley, whose spirit clung to immersion: "The preposition here, Matthew iii, 16, translated out of, has the more general signification of the word from, and would be suitable, whether the sacred writer meant to say that Jesus came out from the water—that is, from the river to the shore, or that he came from the water. This preposition, then, in itself, furnishes no decision in respect to the meaning of the ordinance." Carson on baptism, page 126, speaks thus: "It is said that Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway from the water. I admit that the proper translation of apo is from, not out of." This is a great and frank admission, for one so wedded to water as Carson.

Do not these views look like coming over to our side of the question in part, giving hope of a more general approximation to the whole truth?

From every consideration presented in this chapter, we see that immersionists can gain nothing by finding fault with our English translation, which finely agrees with those above named, which also present wash as a true meaning of baptizo in the Scriptures, which we have proved signifies to sprinkle, when speaking through its noun form of acts recorded in the Old Testament.
CHAPTER VIII.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

In the previous chapter we were compelled to follow up the assertion of the immersionist respecting our translation, which we found to be very incorrect. In this, we shall take up his idea of a specific term, bearing on a positive ordinance, which he assures us *baptizo* is. If we understand the immersionist here, he would have us to know that a positive ordinance requires a specific term to denote the exact manner of its execution.

We pronounce this statement, without ceremony, to be a most positive error, and in the course of this chapter we shall prove it so. Is not the Lord's supper, as well as baptism, a positive ordinance of the most solemn character? Certainly. And was not circumcision a positive ordinance, highly significant to the house of Israel? Most assuredly. Is there a word in the Scriptures to express the exact manner of procedure at the Lord's supper? There is not. Is there a word in the volume of inspiration to set forth the exact mode of circumcision? There is not. And so we answer, as it regards baptism.

The Lord's Supper. We can turn to a word by which this supper is named or pointed out; but this word does not express the manner by which we ought to attend to it, nor imply any form whatever, nor mode. So far then as the word is concerned, we may, without doing any violence to its sense, commune sitting, standing, or kneeling. The word is *deipnon*.

Now, the people who spoke the Greek language, not only used this term to express a full meal, but the principal one. Let the reader here bear in
mind that *deipnon*, the word that designates a positive ordinance, was originally used to express a full meal, and then he will be prepared to see, and to feel, the inconsistency of the immersionist. Do not immersionists think that they commune at the Lord's table when they take a little bread and wine, even fully and properly? Certainly. Now, *deipnon* stands in the same relation to this ordinance that *baptizo* does to the ordinance of baptism. This view of the case will at once lead us to this conclusion, that according to the hypothesis of the immersionist on *baptizo*, bearing on a positive ordinance, not one of them has ever properly commined yet; for the primary meaning of *deipnon*, which designates a positive ordinance, requires a full meal.

Well, if *deipnon* requires a full meal to meet the demands of its grand meaning, and a little bread and wine will do at present when communing, surely a little water poured on the head may safely be allowed to pass for a baptism!

But why talk so, since we proved in the sixth chapter that *baptizo* was used by Paul to denominate acts of sprinkling? We only do so to show the immersionist his errors, and the consequences that march out from his views on positive ordinances.

We see that the Lord's supper is a positive ordinance; still it has no word of a specific nature to express it; therefore, why contend that baptism has?

*Circumcision*. We can point out a term by which this ordinance was understood, but this term did not, of itself, give any definite idea of the procedure, apart from necessary instructions. The ordinance was positive, but the word that expressed it was not specific.

The truth is, that neither Abraham, Isaac, nor
Jacob could have known exactly what to have done by the word. The word was *peritomece*.

The Jews, it is true, circumcised their male children at eight days old, and proselytes at any age; but neither they nor their proselytes knew the exact process by the light of the term *peritomece*.

Three positive ordinances are now before us, circumcision, the Lord’s supper, and baptism: but can any man determine from the words used to denominate them, the precise formulas? He cannot.

Take up a lexicon, and turn to *baptizo*, and you will find *sink* a primary signification. With only this light before us, we would remain in ignorance as it regards the ordinance of baptism in the New Testament, and the manner of its execution. *Sink*, that is, to go to the bottom like a stone. You would be as likely to go to work on this principle, were it not in contravention to humanity, as any other, the meaning of the term being respected.

Take up a lexicon, and turn to *deipnon*, and you will find a *full meal* the proper meaning of the term; hence you would not know, regarding this meaning, how to proceed with the ordinance of the Lord’s supper, nor know the quantity of the elements to be used. *Full meal*; that is, you would say, to use an abundance, and would act accordingly the signification of the term being obeyed.

And take up a lexicon, and turn to *peritomece*, and you will be put in possession of an idea of cutting; but as it regards the minuteness of the operation, you will be found profoundly ignorant.

These reflections, without another comment, are sufficient to convince every immersionist that his idea of positive ordinances fearfully militates against the cause he would advocate, and ruins, by consequence, his own theory.

*Deipnon, peritomece, and baptizo,* when thus viewed,
and carefully studied, will force upon us this conclusion, that they do not determine precisely the modes of the ordinances they designate, nor limit to given amounts in the action.

If we had, in view of these facts, no better argument than this, that a little bread and wine are regarded as sufficient, in the Lord’s supper, for a proper communion, when the word that expresses it requires a full meal, it would be sufficient, of itself, to repel every advocacy of the immersionist, and justify the doctrine of affusion in baptism.

So much, then, for Baptist views on a specific word, and a positive ordinance. Here, too, we find the cause of dipping a sinking business. Affusion, however, meets with favor at this point, as well as at every other point examined.

CHAPTER IX.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Having traced βαπτίζω through the lexicons, the classics, and the Scriptures, and found that it signifies to sprinkle,—and having also traced baptizo through the lexicons, and partially through the Scriptures and the translations, and found that it means to wash, a word that signifies to sprinkle in the Scriptures, as clearly proved in another chapter; moreover, having considered baptizo as applied to a positive ordinance by immersionists, and found it at war, by consequence, with the point it was intended to establish, we are now ready to take a general view of the prepositions en and eis, in connection with baptism, knowing that immersionists make them out-posts of defense.

Useful rules are necessary here, in order to fix
the true sense of the terms at issue, in the different cases that may arise before us.

1. The words *baptizo eis* are generally used in classics, according to the judgment of Stuart and Campbell, to denote an action *in* water.

2. The words *baptizo en* are used in the New Testament, according to the decision of the best critics, to denote an action *with* water.

3. The words *baptizo en* are also used in the New Testament, according to the same authority, to denote an action *at*, or *by* a place, or *in* a place.

4. The words *eis* and *en* always have their significations fixed by the circumstances with which they stand connected; and then they regulate the action and sense of whatever verbs precede them. We are responsible for this rule. It is our own.

We here give an example of *baptizo eis* from the classics. Plutarch says—"Plunge yourself in the sea, *[baptison eis]*." This expresses an action in water, but nothing more.

But, that we may be able to bring all the important examples of *baptizo eis*, and *baptizo en*, that are to be found in the Scriptures in connection with water-baptism, under the test of these rules at once, we must place them in array before the reader:

Matthew iii, 6: *Ebaptizonto en*.
Matthew iii, 11: *Baptizo en*.
Mark i, 4: *Baptizoon en*.
Mark i, 5: *Ebaptizonto en*.
Mark i, 9: *Ebaptisthe eis*.
Luke iii, 16: *Baptisci en*.
John i, 26: *Baptizo en*.
John i, 31: *Baptizoon en*.
John i, 33: *Bapztzein en*.
Acts i, 5: *Baptisthesesthe en*.
Acts xi, 16: *Baptisthesesthe en*.

Now, is it not evident, from this aspect of the
case, if the first rule be applied, that there was only one baptism in water? And is it not equally evident, if the second rule be applied, and then the third, that all the other baptisms occurred at, by, or in places, where John baptized with water, not in water.

That we may properly meet these items of inspiration, we here remark, that eis occupies about the same relation to en, in some cases, that ek does to apo; that is to say, that as ek is a surer sign of an action out of a place than apo, so is eis, wherever found, a surer sign of an action in a place than en. Let it be distinctly understood, however, that there is no certainty with regard to their significations, apart from circumstances, no matter how found, nor where found; hence the necessity of the fourth rule. Ek and apo, it will be perceived, are merely introduced, and their relation to each other alluded to, for the purpose of illustrating the shade of difference, in meaning, that evidently exists between eis and en, the terms now duly under consideration with the verb baptizo.

We said that the significations of eis and en cannot be arrived at, apart from circumstances. The following texts will prove this. Luke xi, 32: “For they repented [eis] at the preaching of Jonas.” Matthew ii, 23: “And he came and dwelt [eis] in a city.” Matthew xxvi, 10: “Why trouble ye the woman? for she hath wrought a good work [eis] upon me.” Luke xxii, 23: “I am ready to go with thee, both [eis] into prison, and [eis] to death.” Numerous examples of this class could be given, but these are all-sufficient, so far as eis is concerned.

Now let us see how en stands. Luke iv, 1: “And was led [en] by the Spirit into the wilderness.” Luke xxiv, 30: “And it came to pass as he sat [en] at meat with them.” Matthew i, 20: c
"The Angel of the Lord appeared \[en\] in a dream." Revelation xix, 15: "And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that \[en\] with it he should smite the nations; and he shall rule them \[en\] with a rod of iron."

Gentle reader, are you not fully convinced, from these quotations, that no rule can determine the meanings of \textit{eis} and \textit{en}, but the rule of circumstances?

We shall now proceed to bring all the points before us to a bearing. We said a moment ago, that \textit{eis} is a surer sign of an action in a place than \textit{en}. This view of the matter will account for the sudden change in the form of speech used by Mark, which is thus manifest: "And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were \textit{ebaptizonto} of him \textit{en} the river Jordan. And it came to pass in those days that Jesus came from Nazareth, of Galilee, and was \textit{ebaptisthee} of him \textit{eis} Jordan." This is a very nice feature in revealed truth; one that will require tender honesty on the part of the investigator. Why did Mark use \textit{en} to express the baptism of the multitude, and \textit{eis} to express the baptism of the Savior? It strikes our judgment, with more than ordinary force, that Mark intended by the use of \textit{en}, speaking of the baptism of the multitude, to show that they were baptized \textit{at} or \textit{by} Jordon, \textit{in} its channel; and by the use of \textit{eis}, speaking of the baptism of Christ, that he was baptized in the water of Jordan. If Mark knew that the multitude were baptized in the water of Jordan, as well as our Lord, it does seem strange, and unaccountable to us, in many respects, that he should say in the fifth verse, and in the ninth verse, what he does—that the multitude were baptized \textit{en} Jordan, and the Savior baptized \textit{eis} Jordan.

We would not lay so much stress on \textit{eis} here,
only for the fact that the Savior was the antitype of Aaron; and on this account he had to enter into the priesthood by a baptismal washing.—Aaron was washed, or baptized, as the Apostle Paul calls it, at the door of the tabernacle, and then anointed with oil; hence it was but meet and right that the antitype, Christ, should undergo a baptismal washing, and then be anointed with the Spirit, before he could enter on his priestly mission. Origen, the learned Greek father, confirms this view. Hear him in his comment on the Epistle to the Romans, c. 6: "Christ was baptized by John, not with that baptism which is in Christ, but with that which is in the law." (See chapter xix—also cut representing this baptism.)

The Savior was *ebaptisthee eis*, and the multitude *ebaptizonto en*. The baptism of the Savior does seem presented in contradistinction to the baptism of the people, as it regards place, and our reasons for so thinking are now before the reader. To avoid the force of these views, an appeal may be made to the cases involved in the Greek, but this, we think, would be very unsatisfactory, and could not reduce the force of our views.

We shall now turn our attention to all the examples of *baptizo en*, as above given. In doing this, we would remark, according to our own rule of judging, that, after circumstances determine the significations of the prepositions *eis* and *en*, such significations regulate the action, and fix the sense of the verb. The first feature of this rule we found true in all the examples quoted in this chapter, which only leaves us to prove that the significations of these prepositions regulate the action of the verb, and fix its sense.

Now for the proof. "For they repented [*eis*] *at." Does not *eis* or *at* regulate the action of the verb *repented*, and fix its sense? And he came and
dwell \([eis]\) in a city." Does not \(eis\) or \(in\) regulate the action of the verb \(dwell\), and fix its sense? "For she hath wrought a good work \([eis]\) upon me." Does not \(eis\) or \(upon\) regulate the action of the verb \(wrought\), and fix its sense? "I am ready to go with thee, both \([eis]\) into prison, and \([eis]\) to death." Do not \(eis\) or \(into\), and \(eis\) or \(to\), regulate the action of the verb \(go\)? "And was led \([en]\) by the Spirit." Does not \(en\) or \(by\) regulate the action of the verb \(led\), and fix its sense? "And it came to pass as he sat \([en]\) at meat with them." Does not \(en\) or \(at\) regulate the action of the verb \(sat\), and fix its sense? "The angel of the Lord appeared unto him \([en]\) in a dream." Does not \(en\) or \(in\) regulate the action of the verb \(appeared\), and fix its sense? "That \([en]\) with it he should smite the nations, and rule them \([en]\) with a rod of iron." Do not \(en\) or \(with\), and \(en\) or \(with\) again, regulate the actions of the verbs \(smite\) and \(rule\), and fix their sense?

It must now be quite obvious to the reader, that the various significations attached to \(eis\) and \(en\) arise out of the circumstances with which these terms are identified; and that no lexicon can give the inquirer after truth their true meanings, apart from the narrations with which they are connected.

Now let us affix \(eis\) and \(en\) to the verb baptize, and see how the matter will work, having the significations and attitudes above given with them. Baptize \([eis,]\) at, baptize \([eis,]\) in, baptize \([eis,]\) upon, baptize \([eis,]\) into; baptize \([en,]\) by, baptize \([en,]\) at, baptize \([en,]\) in, baptize \([en,]\) with.

Is it not therefore indubitably evident, that the action of the verb is regulated, and its sense fixed, by the restrictive sense of the prepositions? And is it not also indisputably evident that the verb has no control over the fixed sense, by circumstances, of these prepositions?
We shall here give another illustration on this point, though it would seem, from what is said, to be unnecessary. We shall suppose A. to be standing on the bank of a river, under this instruction, that he is to [baptize eis] dip to the surface of the water a vessel, (eis meaning to,) would it not be obvious to A. and to all, that the sense thus fixed to the preposition would limit the action of the verb baptize, and unfold its true import in the case? But change the instructions, and affix eis to the verb, giving into as its sense, and then bid A. to dip the vessel, and he will not dip [eis] to, but [eis] into.

From this way of viewing things, if the meaning of eis, in the account given of our Lord's baptism, stood fixed by circumstances at, then the act would not have taken place in the water of Jordan, but at Jordan. Under this light, and its guidance, we proceed to other considerations, which will, we trust, afford some pleasure to the critical reader.

Matthew iii, 6: \( \varepsilon βαπτίζωντο \) en, baptized at, that is to say at Jordan, in its channel—Mark having put eis in contradistinction to \( εν \), in drawing a line between the place of the Savior's baptism and that of the people—the Savior being baptized eis, in the waters of Jordan—and the people en, at Jordan in its channel. Matthew iii, 11: \( \βαπτίζω \) en, baptized with, that is to say with water, seeing that no other signification can be put to \( εν \) here, and that with is one of its proper significations in the Scriptures. Mark i, 4: \( \βαπτίζων \) en, baptizing in, that is to say in the wilderness, at the place he preached—no other meaning being appropriate here. Mark i, 5: \( \varepsilon βαπτίζωντο \) en, baptized at Jordan, in its channel—the reasons above given.—Luke iii, 16: \( \βαπτίσει \) en, baptized with water—the reasons are above given for with representing \( εν \).
John i, 26: Baptizo en, baptized with water, for the previous reason. John i, 31: Baptizeon en, baptized with water—same reason. John i, 33: Baptizein en, baptized with water—same reason. Acts i, 5: Baptistheseste he en, baptized with water—same reason. Acts xi, 16: Baptistheseste he en, baptized with water—same reason.

The reader can now see why we were so particular in fixing the significations of the prepositions, and in showing their influence on the verb, both in act and import.

Those who may dissent from these reflections and conclusions, would do well to inquire into the cause of Mark using baptizo eis to express the baptism of the Savior, and baptizo en to express the baptism of the people; and then how it came to pass that baptizo eis are only used once, in reference to water baptism, in the history of our Lord.

In conclusion we observe, that the reader ought to bear in mind, that en, in some of the quotations in this chapter, refers to place; and so does eis, in the case of our Lord’s baptism, leaving the verb to be understood accordingly; and that en, in some of the same quotations, refers to the mode of baptism; leaving the verb so to be understood both in action and sense.

The baptism for which we contend is a baptism with water. The whole array of the rules, quotations, prepositions, and the verb, as above presented, make this point decidedly satisfactory.

An immersionist may grumble here at our not going at once to the English translation, and try to make capital out of our appeal to the original; but we shall here venture to say, before going there to inquire how John baptized in the wilderness, in Bethabara, in Enon, in Jordan: and to press his mode of baptizing up through the years of the Apostles, that he will see cause to wish us
back in the original; for, whether we go to the English version, the classics, or the lexicons, we shall alike be able to maintain the idea of affusion in baptism.

The reader can see; as far as we have advanced, that the idea of affusion stands out most prominent, and take this for the sign of an abundant harvest.

CHAPTER X.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

It is here in accordance with our design, as intimated in the fourth chapter, and in keeping with the order of our investigation, to turn the attention of the reader to the general character of the prepositions, en, eis, apo, and ek. In the foregoing chapter we gave some examples in connection with the verb baptizo, showing that any one meaning given to the prepositions en and eis by lexicons, would lead the reader of the New Testament astray, apart from consulting the lexicon of circumstances; and we might have then so said of apo and ek, and would have said so only for the fact, that they do not so intimately connect themselves with baptism as the other terms; nor are they as often used in baptism, consequently of inferior interest. We shall now, however, give the diversified bearing of this whole family of prepositions, believing it will be of some advantage to the lover of truth, and that it will shed much light on the question before us—mode of baptism.

The Greek preposition en, from which in is properly translated in some places, by in others, and with in many passages, is made in the hands
of immersionists to say things and do things only equalled by the fabulous story of Hercules strangling a huge serpent when but a child. The truth is, facts being revealed, that the signification of en in the New Testament runs thus: at, by, with, in, into, for, concerning, of, among, after, under.—Render en in always, and sense will stand abashed, and propriety mortified. "He shall baptize you [en] in the Holy Ghost." That is, in plain English, to plunge or dip the disciples in the Holy Ghost. Shocking abuse of language. John's first Epistle, v, 6: "This is he that came [en] in water and blood, not by water only, but [en] in water and blood." Now, put the proper reading of these passages along side of this reading, and an opinion can be formed not very creditable to the cause that would bend even the truth of inspiration to subserve its interest. "He shall baptize you [en] with the Holy Ghost." How simple and beautiful this rendering! "This is he that came [en] by water and blood, not by water only, but [en] by water and blood." Is not this rendering alike simple and beautiful? "Our Lord Jesus Christ [en] in his coming." This too would be the work of an immersionist, when consistent with his theory. The true reading, however, is: "Our Lord Jesus Christ [en] at his coming." "Being baptized [en] in the baptism of John." That is, in a plain form of speech, the Baptist theory being respected, immersed in the immersion of John. Now, let us have the old way of the matter: "Being baptized [en] with the baptism of John." Here we have both sound and sense. Let us take one example more, given in the previous chapter to illustrate a different point. The example is: "And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that [en] with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them [en] with a rod of iron." The immersionist would have the
affair thus, translating here as he would the baptism of the Spirit—the nations [en] in a sword: and ruled [en] in a rod of iron. Here we now have a partial view of the position of en in the New Testament when taken in connection with all the other significations above assigned to it. A prominent meaning is wrrh. The Greek preposition eis from which into is translated in some passages, and in others to, at, en, upon, is construed by immersionists to denote the total dipping of the eunuch in water, there being no other evidence in their favor but this. Well, let us see if any plausible reliance can be placed on this position here. "And when we were fallen [eis] to the ground." "Jesus therefore cometh [eis] to the tomb of Lazarus." "Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple, and came [eis] to the sepulchre: and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first [eis] to the sepulchre, yet went he not [eis] in." We shall give here one example more: "Go thou [eis] to the sea and cast an hook." Now translate the term [eis] into in these passages, and you will make the Scriptures state what Heaven never intended. If the Savior had said to Peter, "Go thou eis the sea and baptize," would not the immersionist have it, that eis here signifies into the sea; therefore Peter immersed? Peter went [eis] to the sea; and Philip and the eunuch went [eis] to the water. From these facts the reader can make up his own opinion. In our judgment, however, this would seem to be the most natural and reasonable construction; but if immersionists are satisfied with the English translation, and feel disposed to dissent from our view at this point, we are perfectly willing to test the matter with them at the court of Caesar.—For whether the eunuch went [eis] to or [eis] into, we shall make it plain, yea, put it beyond doubt, that he was baptized by affusion—if baptized as John baptized.
This gives an idea of the position of eis in numerous passages in the New Testament, and leads us to subscribe to its general significations, at, upon, in, to, into. But is not its leading meaning to? (See Bretschneider.)

The Greek preposition ek, from which out of and from are translated in various places in the Scriptures, is made, in connection with eis, to be a very satisfactory evidence of immersion in baptism. It must be obvious, however, to the scholar, that apo is placed in contrast with eis, and that ek, as well as apo, denotes simply an action from a place. "Apo, from city; eis, to city; and apo, from Jerusalem, eis, to Gaza." "Get thee [ek] from thy kindred." "Howbeit there came other boats [ek] from Tiberias." "Who shall deliver me [ek] from the body of this death?"

Ek means from, as well as out of. The Greek preposition apo signifies from, of, and out of. "This term," says Dr. Cater, "occurs about six hundred and forty-four times in the New Testament, only signifying out of twenty-four times, when properly translated."

The reader, by examining the significations, as given, of the prepositions en, eis, ek, apo, can at once see how various their meanings are in the New Testament.

But with regard to the term eis, we remark, that it would be ventureing too far to state that it does not, when in a single attitude, connected with a verb of motion, signify an action into a place. In its single attitude, as found in the case of the baptism of the eunuch, it generally means to, not into. The previous examples where eis occurs, illustrate this. Eis, be it remembered, often denotes an action to a place, but seldom, when not doubled, an action into a place. To make these points evident, the Greeks, when they wished to express definitely
an action into a place, prefixed *eis* to a verb, such as *eiserchomai eis*, or *embaino eis*; and we may here add, that the inspired writers acted on a similar principle, as the following examples will clearly show: “David [*eiselthen eis*] entered into the house of God.” (Matt. xii, 4.) “Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall [*eiselthen eis*] enter into the kingdom of God.” (Matt. viii, 21.) “Ananias [*eiselthen eis*] entered into the house.” (Acts ix, 17.) Here the reader will perceive that *eis* is doubled, to express an action into a place. This is not the case in the account of the baptism of the eunuch by Philip. Circumstances, however, as we proved in the previous chapter, must determine its signification.

To say that *ek* does not mean *from*, but *out of*, is to state that which is lamentably incorrect,—as lamentably incorrect as to state that it does not mean *out of*, but *from*. Often *from*, often *out of*, is the true sense of the term, in many portions of the Scriptures.

To say that *en* does not mean *with*, but *in*, is to state that which violates all proper rules of thought, and outrages the structure and true teachings of the Hebrew-Greek of the New Testament. Often *with*, often *in*, are true meanings of the term in the Scriptures.

To say that *apo* means *out of* in the case of our Lord’s baptism, and generally means so, is to state that which the water-loving Carson admits is wrong, that which inspiration frowns on. Often *from*, seldom *out of*, is the true attitude of the word in the New Testament. We simply desire to give its sense here, which begins to apply, on the termination of the term “when,” leaving the matter thus: when he was baptized, he went straightway up from the water. In plain English, after his baptism, he went up from the water—simply *from*.

The significations of the words *eis*, *en*, *ek*, and
apo, are now before us, from which we understand affusion only is favored.

We shall here add a few quotations and remarks on the preposition eis, as we intend this chapter for a chapter of reference; and shall, after a few more chapters, argue the question of mode from the English translation.

Professor Stuart says, page 41, that katabaino eis, used in the account of the eunuch’s baptism, often means going down to a place. The following examples will clearly prove this. John ii, 12: “Jesus went down to Capernaum.” Acts xiv, 25: “They went down to Attalia.” The form of speech in these passages is the same, in the original, as that given in the narration of the eunuch’s baptism. The reading of the whole would run thus: Philip and the Eunuch went down [eis] to the water; Jesus went down [eis] to Capernaum; and they went down [eis] to Attalia.

We shall conclude this chapter with this astonishing fact, that eis occurs eleven times in the chapter which sets forth the baptism of the eunuch, and is only translated once into. This is, of a truth, a marvellous affair, and the more so from the fact, that it is translated into in the narration of the eunuch’s baptism. Did Luke intend this? Did he intend eis to signify into once out of eleven times, and ten times out of the eleven quite a different thing? Who will answer this? The influence of trine immersion on the minds of the king’s translators, can only answer and account for this matter. They were immersionists. This is a full explanation. We are not finding fault with them. They were honest men—acted out the light that was in them: still we record our most solemn conviction, that Luke did not intend to convey the idea of going into the water, but the idea of going to the water, where Philip baptized, as John did, with water.
CHAPTER XI.
THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

But after all we have said on the prepositions, we observe that those conversant with the water controversy, are apprised that the main issue is made, and must be made, on the import of the term *baptizo*; and to our mind it is evident that the use the Scriptures make of the word must finally settle the question. Under this persuasion, in the outset of this chapter, we shall take a decided stand, and make an issue with immersionists on their own grounds—promising to the reader that we shall prove by their own translations all we care to contend for. Campbell's translation, Mark vii, 3, 4, reads thus: "For the Pharisees, and indeed all the Jews, who observe the traditions of the elders, eat not, except they have washed their hands by pouring a little water on them, and when they come from the market by dipping them." Now, does not this passage clearly set forth a line of distinction between those that returned from the market, and those that were not at the market, making it only binding on those that were not at the market to have their hands washed by causing a little water to be poured on them? Will it not therefore absolutely follow, if *baptizo* is used in any case, in the New Testament, to designate washing before eating, where the person was not at the market, that pouring, according to this translation, is the signification, or at least, one of its significations in the New Testament? We most confidently assert here, and defy contradiction, that if a solitary case can be found, where the verb is so used, in the New Testament, pouring is made the meaning of the word. In view of testing this
matter by the rule laid down in Campbell's trans-
tion, that when at the market dipping was required
before eating, but when not at the market only a
little water was poured on the hands, let us turn
to Luke xi, 37, 38, where we at once see that the
Savior had been preaching when invited by the
Pharisee to dine with him. These verses read
thus: "And as he spake, a certain Pharisee be-
sought him to dine with him: and he went in, and
sat down to meat. And when the Pharisee saw it,
he marveled that he had not first [ebaptisthce]
washed before dinner." Here we have the very
form of the verb, letter for letter, that Mark em-
joys to designate the baptism of our Lord by John,
used by Luke to point out the washing of hands,
which was done, Campbell's translation deciding,
by having a little water poured on them. Let
immersionists escape from this if they can. We
say it is impossible. We invite their attention to
this meaning, clearly fixed by their own transla-
tion, and bid them, if they can, to resist this con-
viction, and deny this conclusion. We have always
been astonished at the blindness of Campbell when
this translation was approved. We cannot well con-
ceive how he could have lost sight of the case of
the Savior in Luke xi, 38, when he allowed the
translation of Mark vii, 3, 4, to pass through his
hands. We say blindness; for a child, capable of
reading and thinking, ought to have seen, and
ought to see, that the case of the Savior would fall
under the rule of washing his hands by having a
little water poured on them—he not being at the
market, hence not under the rule of dipping, which
required the person to be at the market.

Men may parade lexicons, and read over and
over all the places where baptizo occurs in the New
Testament, in order to fix its meaning, but from no
quarter can we gather more light on this point than
from Mark vii, 3, 4, and Luke xi, 38. The truth is, that *nipsoontai*, and *ebaptisthees*, are used to express the washing of hands, which Campbell says was done by pouring a little water on them, and which Josephus says was done by sprinkling water on them, which the verb *baptizo*, in Luke xi, 38, seems to express, to use his own idea.

One remark more before dismissing Campbell's translation, which establishes not only all we want, but more than we need. In the third verse *nipsoontai* is used, and in the fourth verse *baptisoontai*; and we are satisfied on this account that the said translation was made to cause a marked difference between these terms, which led to the consequence we carefully noted above.

We shall now invite the attention of the reader to the Missionary Baptist translation of Mark vii, 3, 4, which runs thus: "For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, eat not unless they wash their hands carefully, holding the tradition of the elders. And when they come from the market, they eat not till they have bathed themselves." The same reasoning and conclusion that are connected with our remarks on Campbell's translation, would apply here. This translation makes a careful washing of the hands necessary when not at the market, and a bathing necessary when at the market. But when we turn to Luke xi, 38, of this translation, we find *ebaptisthees* translated bathe, which not only palpably violates the rule set forth in the translation of Mark vii, 3, 4, but most horribly violates the plain truths connected with the text. The Savior had not been in the market. How can—how dare, any man venture to translate Luke xi, 38, as if the Savior had been at the market? It shocks our moral sensibility to look on so flagrant a violation of the truth of inspiration. Mark vii, 3, can be translated under the idea of washing the
hands carefully, when not at the market; and the 4th verse under the idea of bathing after returning from the market; but when Luke xi, 38 is to be translated, the truth of God must be perverted to subserve the purpose of immersion, by presenting the case of the Savior, in the translation, as if he had been at the market. We invite the attention of all to this, but especially the attention of every Baptist that has any regard for the plain teachings of the book of God.

It will not do for a would-be critic to say that nipsoontai is used in Mark vii, 3, and baptisoontai in the 4th verse, and therefore the necessity of a difference. This will not in the most remote sense obviate the difficulty. The question is, was the Savior in the market? If not, the translation is a falsehood, told and published on the Spirit of all truth.

Dr. McKnight translates Mark vii, 4, thus: “For when they come from the market, except they dip themselves they eat not.” Now, as the Savior had not been in the market, his case, which is pointed out by the use of the term ebaptisthe, fell in with the case described in Mark vii, 3, by the use of the term nipsoontai; thereby making both words the same in meaning in these instances. But rather than allow this to be so, inspiration must be bent to the notions of immersionists on the term baptizo. It will never do for them to admit that this darling word of theirs was used to point out an act, simply the washing of hands by having a little water poured or sprinkled on them. This would totally ruin their cause. The Holy Spirit, however, caused Mark and Luke to fix this meaning to it, and as long as men who love truth more than party will be found on earth, this signification of the word will be advocated.

But we have not with these remarks entirely
disposed of this deceitful manner of handling the word of God. O, no! The matter is of too much importance, and too much interest, to be passed over slightly. There is one thing most remarkable and singular about the whole affair; namely, how it came to pass that Baptists would contend that *baptizo* uniformly signifies in the New Testament immersion, yet translate it by the term bathe, in Mark vii, 4, and Luke xi, 38. Nor is this all; they do not inform us what part of the body was bathed—whether hands, feet, head, neck, or the whole person. We always thought that Baptists taught the people that *baptizo* is a specific word; ever signifying to immerse; but lo! and behold! the very moment their translators get to Mark vii, 4, and to Luke xi, 38, this specific word becomes a convertible thing, having the sense of *bathed*, which term Webster informs us signifies: “Washed, as in a bath; moistened with a liquid; bedewed.” Well, well, in the sixth edition of the Baptist Bible, which is now before us, published in 1847, we clearly see that *baptizo* is made to signify moistened with a liquid; bedewed. We hope they will complain no more about the meaning we attach to it. Surely this translation, of their own making, reduces the term to as small a point as any Pedobaptist would contend for. *Bedewed.* And has it come to this, that *baptizo* means to bedew! The reader can look at the translations as given in this chapter, and then at the import of the term *bathed*, as given by Webster, and he will be perfectly satisfied on this subject.

We insist on pressing the inquiry, why did they not translate the word immerse in Mark vii, 4, and in Luke xi, 38? Will some one of the immersing household explain this matter to the public, and enlighten us on how it comes to pass that the term in these places may signify to bedew, and not to bedew in other portions of the Scriptures?  


But there is something else connected with this matter quite novel. The 4th verse of the 7th of Mark contains in the original *baptizoontai*, and *baptismous*. The former term is translated by the Baptists *bathed*, and the latter *immersing*. Why all this, if the word means always to immerse!

The translation is not only deceitful, but a shocking abuse of language. The 3d and 4th verses of Mark 7th are in a parenthetic attitude in the original, showing *nipsoontai* and *baptizoontai*. Both terms are the same in sense in the passage—were intended to be so by the writer, who acted on the law of the interchange of words, common to the Scriptures, and all writings. But to render *nipsoontai wash, baptizoontai bathed, and baptismous immersing*, is an unpardonable offense against propriety and truth.

The Missionary Baptist translation, so called in this chapter, was rejected by a majority of the members of the Baptist Bible Society, at its annual meeting, in New York, this year, but heartily subscribed to, and advocated by the minority. We make this observation here, to avoid a false issue. This version, however, so far as baptism is concerned, but speaks the sentiments of every immersionist, if practice be the judge.

From this version, and Campbell's translation, it will be seen we sustain affusion. This is doubly confirmed by our established version, which shows that *baptize* was used to express the washing of hands among the Jews, which was done by the application of water, in the form of pouring. In proof of this: "Here is Elisha, the son of Shaphat, who poured water on the hands of Elijah." (2 Kings iii, 11.)

The language of Josephus on this point is: the verb *baptize* "seems to be used concerning washing of hands, which is done by sprinkling." Observat. Sac. pars 3, Observ. 26, 2 Lips. 1725.
Wetstein, speaking on this point, says, "That the act was done with as much water, at least, as they could hold in the hollow of the hand, the fingers being gathered up."

Here then we have Josephus and Wetstein making it appear that the washing of hands, which \[ebaptisthee\] was applied to, was done by the application of a small quantity of water. This also is the testimony of the Scriptures.

No wonder that Campbell and the Baptist translators ran ashore here, with the words \[pouring, wash, bathed\], which they here give in their translations.

Of a truth, immersion is getting sick unto death.

CHAPTER XII.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

In our last, we spoke of a translation of the Scriptures in the English language by the Baptists, and gave a sample therefrom. The title page runs thus: "The Holy Bible; being the English Version of the Old and New Testaments, made by order of King James I., carefully Revised and Amended, by several Biblical Scholars. Sixth Edition. Mansville, Jefferson county, N. Y. Published by D. S. Dean & Rhodes Baker, Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. Stereotyped by L. Johnson. 1847." Let it then be no longer a matter of doubt concerning the Baptists having a Bible of their own, exactly suited to their creed on baptism. We admit that it is not generally received; still, does it not reflect their ideas of baptism? And have they not sent such a Bible to foreign lands? Would they not generally receive it, only for fear
of the results? The truth is, it exactly speaks what they preach, but what they fear to give in type to the world.

We have concluded to present the public with a number of quotations from it, in this chapter, not only for their special benefit and edification, but for the sake of making the doctrine of affusion remarkably luminous by contrast.

Now, we bespeak careful attention to its workings.

In 2 Kings v, 10, we read: "And Elisha sent a messenger to him, saying, Go and bathe in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again to thee, and thou shalt be clean.”

So *louo* signifies to bathe, and *baptizo* too, according to the sense here, when taken in connection with the translation in Mark vii, 4; and Luke xi, 38, given in the previous chapter.

But let us proceed to the 14th verse, which reads: “Then went he down, and dipped himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God: and his flesh came again like to the flesh of a little child, and he was clean.”

Naaman was only told to wash, and the writer of Kings points out the act by the use of the word *ebaptisato*. How strange then the thought, that *louo* should be magnified into a dipping process! He was not told to dip himself in Jordan, but to wash himself. If we are under a disease that affects a portion of our bodies, and are told by a physician to wash, do we understand him to bid us dip our whole bodies? No. If he dipped himself he did what he was not commanded to do. Jerome, the author of the Vulgate, we think, gives the proper rendering of the passage: “He went down and washed in Jordan seven times, according to the saying of the man of God.” Does not this agree with the command of the prophet, “Go and
wash?” We cannot conceive how the thought ever crept into the mind of man, that Naaman immersed or dipped himself in Jordan. Did not Origen say the altar was baptized, which had only water poured on it? In like manner the writer of the book of Kings spoke, in calling the occurrence in Naaman’s case a baptism, or, that he baptized himself in Jordan. Washed with the water of Jordan, no doubt, is the true meaning.

Let us now turn to Matt. iii, 5, 6: “Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region around the Jordan, and were immersed by him in the Jordan, confessing their sins.”

Josephus informs us that one million one hundred thousand people perished in the siege of Jerusalem. Add to this the fact that Judea included nearly one half of the territory of Palestine, west of Jordan—not to say one word concerning the region round about Jordan, which included most of the territories of Samaria, Perea, and a large portion of Galilee, and there is a field for calculation, which will present the round number, at a low estimate, of three million, the subjects of John’s baptism. John baptized about 227 days, which, when viewed at 12 hours actual labor each day, will present us with the thought, that he baptized 1101 every hour of the preceding time. Let him believe this that can, and subscribe to immersion. The above quotation says they were all immersed. Our faith draws back, and staggers under the pressure of impossibility.

The 11th verse of this chapter reads: “I indeed immerse you in water to repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he will immerse you in the Holy Spirit, and fire.”

We can conceive how they could have been immersed in water, but the idea of immersing into
the Holy Spirit shadows our sense into confusion. The former could be understood as an action in, but the latter never can be so understood. The Spirit fell on them; and no matter how overwhelmed with its influence, the action was on them by it, and not in it by them. If John were represented as immersing the people by overwhelming them with water, and not in water, then there would be an evident propriety in the language of this quotation: but as the facts stand, it is an insult to the common understanding of mind, and a plain perversion of the teachings of inspiration.

The 16th verse reads thus: "And Jesus, being immersed, went up immediately from the water: and the heavens were opened to him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and coming upon him."

Here we have the old cry, he went up straightway out of the water, totally forsaken. So apo at last is admitted to mean from, and not out of. This gives us some hope. Perhaps the next translation will bring them to their sober sense. The Savior was immersed. Was Aaron immersed—his type? As well might they say one was immersed as the other. The Savior was baptized by being washed in Jordan, as Aaron was washed at the door of the tabernacle; and, as the one was anointed with oil, so the other was anointed by the Spirit. We wonder that they did not so fix the matter, as to represent the Savior as being immersed in the Spirit. They had as just a foundation for this, as they had in representing the descent of the Spirit, of which John spoke, under the idea of an immersion of the disciples.

Matthew xxviii, 19: "Go therefore and disciple all the nations, immersing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."

Let us now turn to Mark i, 4, which reads:
“John came immersing in the desert, and proclaiming the immersion of repentance, for the remission of sins.”

John came immersing in the desert—right in the desert. Here they give us a dry land immersion, which took place in the desert—not in Jordan. The immersion of repentance, however, is too sublime a thought for our humble comprehension; hence we must pass it by, regretting the intellectual loss.

The 8th and 9th verses read: “I indeed immerse you in water: but he will immerse you in the Holy Spirit. And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was immersed by John in the Jordan.”

Here we have once more an immersion in the Spirit. The word, of itself, presupposes an immerser, the person to be immersed, and the thing in which the person is to be immersed. Can the word be used apart from these thoughts, in a religious sense? It cannot. Pray, then, who immersed the disciples in the Spirit? This is the point, and right here the confusion of thought begins. Did the Spirit descend on the disciples, or were they taken and plunged in the Spirit? We pity the cause that has to be supported by so fearful an abuse of language. God baptized them from heaven by pouring forth his Spirit on them.

Mark xvi, 16: “He that believeth and is immersed, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be condemned.”

Let us now turn to John’s Gospel, i, 28: “This took place in Bethabara, beyond the Jordan, where John was immersing.”

Well, here they give us another dry land immersion; for, if the front doors of Bethabara opened over the water of the Jordan, John could not have baptized there, and be said to have baptized in
Jordan. But we understand, says the immersionist, when it is said he baptized in the desert, and in Bethabara, that the thing was done in water. This is begging the question, as it has not been proved that John ever wet the soles of his feet in water, when officiating.

In Acts ii, 38, we read: "And Peter said unto them, Repent, and let each of you be immersed in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

Let us now turn to Romans vi, 4: "Therefore we were buried with him by our immersion into his death: that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also should walk in newness of life."

The only thing remarkable here is, that the structure of the original text is completely abused, and made to say what it never did, and never can say, when the rules of the language are respected. All this, however, because the verb in the Old English translation is in the present tense, and at war with the idea of water baptism, which had taken place long before the text was written. Were must supplant the place of the present tense, and even immerse the people—not in water, but in the actual death of the Son of God. Shame! shame! Could the truth in the passage blush, in proportion to the indignity offered, we should soon see the magnitude of the offense.

In 1 Cor. x, 2, we read: "And were all immersed to Moses in the cloud and the sea."

Immersed to Moses—not in water, nor in the sea, nor in the cloud, but to Moses—just to him. All the hosts of Israel, men, women, and children, were immersed to Moses. This is decidedly the greatest outrage on language, sense, and propriety, that we have ever met with—except Campbell's rendering of the same passage, which, if our mem-
ory does not deceive us, has it, immersed into Moses. Pray, if Moses were to rise from the dead, and to hear that all Israel were immersed into him, would he not feel surprised at the advocate of ancient Christianity restored?

We shall conclude this chapter with one quotation more, hoping that the reader is now better pleased with the plain and beautiful statements of the Old English Bible than he ever was before.

John x, 40: "And went away again beyond the Jordan, into the place where John at first immersed, and remained there."

Well, if John first immersed in Jordan, how did it come to pass that Jesus went into the place where he first immersed, and remained there? Could he go into Jordan, and remain there? Ah! this is the point.

Those intended for destruction by the gods, are first made mad. How appropriate the idea here!

Now, let us take one of these examples, say the first, the case of Naaman, and we shall find it ripe with affusion. The prophet told him to wash, not to baptize, in Jordan. Baptizo was afterward substituted for louo by the writer of Kings, and occupies the attitude of the word wash, as a substituted word always drops its native meaning, and assumes the meaning of the term it represents. This is the situation of baptizo here, and the man that does not know this, ought not to be reasoned with. The Baptist Bible has it bathe. This word affords no ground for controversy here. It will suit our purpose as well as wash. Naaman was told to bathe or wash in Jordan. Now, if a man have a disease on his arm, and is told to wash or bathe, by a physician, in a basin, or in a pond, does he understand the instruction to imply a total immersion of the body, not excepting the hairs of his head? He
does not; nor did any reasonable man so understand such instruction since the world began.

He washed in Jordan, or bathed in Jordan. A. washed, or bathed in a basin, in a pond, in a river. Did A. dip his whole body in the basin? No. He simply washed in the basin. To wash in any place, is generally understood to wash with the water contained in the place pointed out by the word in. "I washed this morning in a bowl," says B. The meaning is, he washed with the water contained in the bowl. A child ought to comprehend this.

See then how the washing or bathing of Naaman sets forth the idea of affusion!

Let us now see if the Scriptures will not justify this view. Lev. xiv, 7: "And he [the priest] shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from his leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean." In the 8th verse: "And he that is to be cleansed shall wash himself in water." Surely the prophet had this in view when he told Naaman to wash seven times in Jordan. If not, why such an agreement between him and the act of the priest in sprinkling seven times?

Naaman applied the water of Jordan to his leprosy, and in this sense washed in Jordan. This is the way baptizo works in the Scriptures!
CHAPTER XIII.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

The reader will please bear in mind that the last two chapters disclose to us this truth, that\textit{ baptizo} is made to signify to \textit{bathe}, also to \textit{pour}, according to the translations of Campbell and the Baptists. Now, if there is not a shade of difference between baptize and bathe, why did not the Baptist translation always give immerse? The work shows that this thought was felt, seriously felt, when the word immerse had to be given up for the word bathe, a term that often signifies affusion in all its forms. Campbell labored under the same feeling when he allowed the word pour a place in his publication of the New Testament; a term, in the connection in which it stands, which represents the full meaning of \textit{baptizo} in Luke xi, 38. Of a truth, in view of these considerations, we may well say, out of their own mouths we find their whole system condemned.

We shall now, notwithstanding this, give the immersionist a fair hearing before the bar of the classics. But in proceeding to bring the mind of the reader up to this point we remark, that he cannot have his eyes and mind too often refreshed with these facts, that the Greek of the New Testament and classic Greek are not to be understood in all particulars exactly alike, and on some things widely different—that classic lexicons and lexicons on the New Testament, ought never to be confounded. This needful and absolutely necessary distinction, if always made, would save the public mind from the fearful absurdities of immersionists, and qualify it to hear and judge understandingly. Let us here take the classic signification of \textit{baptizo}, for an
Illustration, in contrast with its Scriptural signification. The lexicographer, Robinson, speaking of baptism in a classic sense, says, it signifies, "To immerse, to sink;" but says, when speaking of its Scriptural sense, that it means, "To wash, to cleanse by washing, to wash oneself, to bathe, perform ablutions." Does not this aspect of the term materially alter the case, and show that there is a wide difference between the classic meaning of the word and the signification attached to it in the Scriptures? Does not the former begin with immerse, and the latter with wash? We cannot conceive how men can reconcile their conduct with moral honesty, when they palm off on the public mind the classic sense of the term—knowing that the Apostles neither spoke nor wrote classic Greek, but merely employed Greek words to convey their thoughts to others. The Apostles were Hebrews, and as such they wrote and spoke, conveying Hebrew ideas through the medium of Greek terms.—The Hebrew-Greek, or Hellenistic dialect, is the name given to the original language of the New Testament by the learned world.

We shall, however, show in this chapter, that baptism is used precisely, in the classics, to express a thing that had been done, or should be done; and not definitely to express mode. If we sustain this—and sustain it we shall—we then drive the advocates of exclusive immersion from their pagan grounds, and leave their cause hopeless from this quarter.

Aratus says, "If the crow has baptized [ebapsato] his head in the river." Now, if as much water had come on the crow's head, would not Aratus have called it a baptism? We are satisfied he would, and shall prove this to be so by the next example. The manner of the act of the crow was not intended by the writer, but the act itself; for he must have
known that it generally wets only one side at a time, being instinctively so taught, for self-protection.

If this be the classic use of *baptizo*, there is but poor encouragement from this quarter for the advocates of total dipping. If as small a portion of a person were dipped in water as there was of the crow, we are certain that the act would not be called an immersion. But it may be said that Aratus only spoke of a baptism of the head. We know this, and here ask, how much of the candidate is immersed under water, by some ministers who cause the person to get down on his knees, so that nothing but the head and shoulders are plunged by them! Do not all such candidates, immerse three-fourths of themselves? Yet we are told they are totally plunged by the ministers. There ought to be some improvement made here, or all such baptisms might justly be classified with the example before us, a baptism of the head. This point is seriously stated, and as seriously felt; for we cannot see how men can speak of total immersion, while the candidate wets the greater portion of himself.

Here is the promised example. Hippocrates, when giving directions concerning a blister plaster, said: "Baptize [*baptizo*] or moisten it with breast milk or Egyptian ointment." Now, no matter what plan was adopted to apply the breast milk to it, the process favored affusion, or was actually affusion. If the breast milk was applied directly from the breast, then the act was affusion; and if the milk was secured in a vessel, it had to be poured on the plaster, and the act was affusion. In either case, the use of the word here ruins the claim of immersion. But was there any other way of having the plaster baptized with milk! We know of one more, and only one—namely, that of having...
it put on by a sponge; and this, too, would have been equal to affusion. Can immersionists find the word so used in the Scriptures as to preclude the possibility of any other meaning than dipping? They cannot. And now, with all their love of classics, and confidence therein, as supporting their theory of plunging, we here give an example that precludes the idea of immersion in all its forms, and demonstrates affusion in the most clear light.—Hippocrates, however, did not directly intend to express the mode of having the matter attended to, but the thing to be accomplished—the very doctrine for which we are contending here, in connection with the idea that as much water applied to the head of the crow would have been called a baptism. If this blister plaster example do not prove this, twice two do not prove the number four.

In one case the head was brought in contact with the fluid, and in the other the fluid was applied to the plaster. We ask, and is this the way that examples from the classics are likely to work?

Aristotle says, “The Phenicians who inhabit Cadiz, relate that sailing beyond Hercules' Pillar, in four days, with the wind at east, they came to a land uninhabited, whose coast was full of seaweeds, and is not [baptizesthai] overflowed at ebb; but when the tide comes in, it is wholly covered.” Does this favor immersion? Was the coast put into the water? Did not the water flow up on the coast? In short, does not this example also favor affusion, so far as the act of coming on is concerned? Still the question arises, was it the intention of Aristotle to set forth mode? We unhesitatingly answer, no. He merely intended to designate an overflow of water, which he denominated a baptism of the coast, as Hippocrates did the blister plaster. The quantity of the fluid, in either case, does not alter the sense of the word. The act in
the application of the fluid was the very thing aimed at by both.

Strabo, when speaking of the soldiers of Alexander the Great, said, "They were baptized to the waist [baptizomenous] when marching, in the winter season, between Climax, a mountain in Pamphalia, and the sea." Surely it is evident here that Strabo did not intend the mode of wetting, but the condition in which they were placed by their contact with water.

Strabo, speaking of Tata, a marsh, said, "The water rises so as to overwhelm anything [baptistheni]." No matter how high the water rose, and no matter how wide it spread, the act was the thing spoken of and intended, which was that of coming on. The water baptized that which it came in contact with, which is in perfect keeping with the act of affusion, which signifies an application or coming on.

Reiskius says, "A ship [ababtistros] unbaptized, is a vessel not baptized in the waves." Of a truth, the whole ship was not plunged under water.—The idea is, that the waves rolled on the vessel, and thus baptized her. The exact manner was not thought of by the writer. Total immersion is not even favored here; for the waves rolled on the vessel. The contact of water was the great object in the mind of the writer, and this he named a baptism. Sometimes the waves send up a quantity of water on and over the vessel; and at other times a flying spray, that sprinkles everything.—The exact manner of this baptism, under such circumstances, could not have been in the thoughts of the writer. The act was principally intended, but no more.

Plutarch says, "Overwhelmed [bebaptismenos] with debts." Surely he did not intend to express mode here. The pressure of debts was what he
aimed at, and what he applied the term to. The idea of affusion, however, is in the example; inasmuch as we know the demands of debts come on us, without an exception, which is contrary to immersion, which presupposes an action into. But it may be said in reply, that a person can be overwhelmed with debts. This is granted; but when we say that a man was overwhelmed with water, do we not mean an action of the water on the person, and not an action of the person in water?—Here it is used as in the previous example.

Chrysostom says, "Overwhelmed [baptizomenos] with innumerable cares." The previous thoughts all apply here.

Diodorus Siculus, when speaking of the flowing of the Nile, said, "Most of the land animals that are intercepted by the river perish, being overwhelmed [baptizomena.] Was it not the thing or act he had in view, and not the mode. Does not the act, however, favor affusion? Were the land animals plunged in the water? No. The water came on them, which is incompatible with dipping into.

Plutarch, in speaking of a Roman general, when about to die, after being mortally wounded, said: "He set up a trophy, on which, having [baptisus] baptized his hand in blood, he wrote this inscription," &c. Did not Plutarch, in this instance, use the word to express an act that was neither more nor less than a mere moistening of the finger?—What approximation is there to an absolute immersion here? Not the slightest. It was an act of wetting or moistening the finger.

Polybius, speaking of a sea fight between the Carthagienians and the Romans, says, "They [baptizōn] sunk, or immersed many of the vessels of the Romans." The mere sinking of the vessels was what the writer intended to express, and nothing
more. But how fatal is this to immersion, as held by Baptists, which presupposes a rising up after being down! The zo added to *bapto* is regarded by learned immersionists as signifying a lifting up.—But here the zo makes a complete failure—sends things to the bottom, even without the hope of a resurrection. Here we may well say, alas for zo as well as *bap*. For this singular idea on *bapto*, in connection with zo, see Campbell's Debate with Rice, p. 78.

Themistius says, "The pilot cannot tell but he may save one in the voyage that had better be *drowned* [*baptizai*] *sunk* into the sea." The above reflections will all apply here, with the exception of the idea on the resurrection. The person that was (*baptizo*) drowned, or sunk into the sea, will rise again; but the zo must wait a long time in the case.

And is this the way that classic examples prove that *baptizo* signifies to dip the person totally into water, and then take him up out of it? If so, the failure is of a wholesale character.

We have here before us twelve classic examples, which run as follows: First, the baptism of a crow's head; secondly, the baptism of a blister plaster; thirdly, a baptism of a coast; fourthly, the baptism of Alexander's soldiers; fifthly, the baptism of a marsh; sixthly, the baptism of a ship; seventhly, a baptism with debts; eighthly, a baptism with cares; ninthly, a baptism of animals; tenthly, a baptism in blood; and the eleventh and twelfth embody a baptism of a vessel and the baptism of a person. Now, the first involves the idea of applying a thing partially to water, the second the idea of applying the fluid to the thing, the third the same, the fourth a partial contact with water, the fifth the application of water in the form of a flow, the sixth the rolling of waves against a vessel, the
seventh the coming on of debts, the eighth the roll-
ing on of cares, the ninth the application of water
by an overflow, the tenth the contact of a finger
with blood, the eleventh the sinking of vessels, and
the twelfth the sinking of a person.

We wish it well understood here, that seven of
these examples favor affusion, which involves the
idea of coming on, or an application; that two of
them plainly express sinking to the bottom, to re-
main; and that the other three imply a partial
contact with fluids, which we proved, at the outset
of this chapter, would have been called a baptism,
if the same amount of fluid had been applied by
coming on.

_Baptizo_, as used by immersionists, signifies a to-
tal immersion, and then a lifting up out of the
water. How does this comport with the above ex-
amples? It is unknown to them.

We shall just add here, if a spring-tide were
to come over a man, the act would involve the idea
of affusion, which is the application of water; but
on the other hand, if a spring-tide were to come
over a person in baptism, the immersionist would
reject the matter, the dip not being in it. Thus
we ruin from the classics, both _zo_ and _bap_, as sub-
scribed to by immersionists. In view of these facts
we suppose that immersionists are about as wea-
ry of our testimony from the classics, and our com-
ment thereon, as they are with the remembrance
of other testimony in the foregoing chapters. Be
this as it may, there is one thing certain—made
certain by the examples before us—that it is the
principal province of _baptizo_ to designate an occur-
rence, without defining the exact formula of it.—
No exact mode can be twisted out of these exam-
pies; hence it is a matter of unaccountable sur-
prise to see men laboring to prove from such exam-
pies that _baptizo_ means to place a person entirely
under water, and then to lift him up out of it. No such thought can be found here!

Immersion, as advocated by Baptists, we brought before the bar of the classics, where it stands condemned. Here we leave it for the present, inviting attention thereto.

We shall now add, in the form of an overture, that Mahommed, in the Koran, calls baptism a "divine dyeing." Dyeing, we know, was sometimes performed by sprinkling. The thing accomplished, without any definite thought on manner, doubtless was what he intended to express.

We spoke of the word *bathe*, in the beginning of this chapter, as given in the Baptist translation to represent *baptizo*; and here we shall throw some light on the term by a quotation from Dr. Johnston, who gives Dryden for authority: "I'll bathe your wounds in tears for my offense." Well, has this representation of *baptizo* (*bathe*) come to this, that falling tears set forth its import? Truly it has.—How appropriate, our eyes being fixed on this chapter, the sentiment of Dr. Owen: "Truth and good company will give a modest man confidence."
CHAPTER XIV.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

The immersionist, in view of our last, thinks he can furnish us with a difficulty, an insurmountable difficulty, on the supposition that the ordinance of baptism required a total covering of the candidate in water, "that there is not another term in the Greek language, whether spoken by pagans or apostles, that can properly express baptizing in the sense subscribed to by Baptists, if baptizo be rejected." We reply, that this is a great mistake, and here give the opinion of the learned Horsey, who says, "The Greek language would have furnished him [the Savior] with terms indisputably precise and exact. Of this kind have been reckoned, and I think properly, katabuthizo, katapontizo, kataduno or kataduo, not to say dupto, and buthizo."

We shall here present the definitions given to these terms by lexicographers. Henry Stephens says that buthizo signifies to "cast into a gulf, the deep, or the sea; to plunge down." He also says, "Katabuthizo signifies the same, and is more commonly used."

Pasor defines the term thus: "To plunge down, to cast into the deep; 1 Tim. vi, 9; 2 Macab. xii, 4; Luke v, 7."

Hedericus gives to the word this meaning: "To plunge; from buthos, a whirlpool, a bottomless pit, or the deep." Speaking on katabuthizo, he testifies thus: "To cast into a gulf, or the deep, to plunge down."

Hedericus defines dupto in this manner: "To go under or into water; to plunge."

Schrivellius gives to dupto this signification: "To go under or into water; from which the English terms dip and dive have been derived."
Henry Stephens attaches this import to *kataduno* or *kataduo*: “To enter within or into a more interior place; to enter into a gulf or the deep.”

Hedercicus defines the term thus: “To go into a more interior place, to enter into a gulf or the deep; to plunge down, to plunge under.”

Henry Stephens defines *pontizo* as follows: “To plunge into the sea: *katapontizo* is most frequently used, and signifies to plunge down into the sea, to plunge under.”

Hedercicus fixes this sense to it: “To plunge down into the sea, to plunge under. Matt. xviii, 6. *Katapontistes*, is one that plunges others into the sea.”

Let us now present a few examples from the Scriptures, that will evidently show that plunging is most positively set forth, beyond all doubt, all cavil, where any of these terms are employed. For instance, we find *kataduo* thus employed, in connection with *katapontizo*: “Pharaoh’s chariots and his host hath he cast into the sea: his chosen captains also are drowned [*katapothesan*] in the Red Sea. The depths have covered them: they sank into the bottom [*katadusan eis buthon*] as a stone.” “Why wilt thou swallow up [*katapontizois*] the inheritance of the Lord?” (See Ex. xv, 4; 2 Sam. xx, 19.) In Matthew xiv, 30: “But when he saw the wind boisterous, he was afraid, and beginning to sink, [*katapontizesthai*] he cried, saying, Lord, save me.”

Again, we find in Matthew xviii, 6, “But whose shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned [*katapontisthe*] in the depths of the sea.”

Luke v, 7: “And they beckoned unto their partners, which were in the other ship, that they should come and help them. And they came, and filled both the ships, so that they began to sink [*buthizesthai*].”
1 Timothy vi, 9: "But they that will be rich fall into temptation, and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown [buthizusi] men in destruction and perdition."

In these examples we perceive, without a shadow of a doubt, the idea of immersion. Had there been any one of these terms used to point out or designate baptism, the matter, in connection with these instances, could not be doubted, dipping would be clearly set forth, and supported by facts; but, as the case now stands, there is not the first instance in all the Scriptures where the word baptize seems to justify the idea of a total immersion. It is certainly very remarkable, if baptism was intended to signify to dip, by the inspired writers, and to be so understood by the church for all ages, that not one of them so employed it, when there was an opportunity to introduce it, in the sense of plunging.

Matthew has a case right before him of sinking into the water, when the faith of Peter began to give way; still he uses katapontizo, and not baptizo.

Again we find Matthew having the most striking opportunity to introduce baptizo, in the case of the offense offered to the little ones who believed in the Savior; still he uses katapontizo. If he quoted the exact language of the Savior, then we learn that the Savior did not employ baptizo to convey the idea of sinking into water, but katapontizo.

Luke has an opportunity to use baptizo in the example of the ship sinking; nevertheless, he sees fit to call in buthizo to express the occurrence.

Paul had a fine opening to bring in baptizo, when speaking of men being sunk into hurtful lusts—plunged into them; and yet this very Paul, who wrote the sixth chapter of Romans, brings into service buthizo to set forth the idea of being submerged, or immersed in hurtful lusts, and leaves
baptizo unemployed—the very term, according to the theory of the Baptists, that would have most happily expressed the thought.

From the office or province of the foregoing words, and the total neglect evinced towards baptizo by Matthew, Luke, and Paul, when they might have, could have used it with the greatest appropriateness, on the hypothesis of the Baptists, we are satisfied that they did not look on baptism as implying plunging into water, or they would not have employed katapontizo and buthizo as they did, under such circumstances, but baptizo.

When the church was found practicing immersion, after the Apostles had been long sleeping in their graves, we find kataduo used to express it. Professor Stuart says, “The Greek words kataduo and katadusis were employed as expressive of baptizing and baptism; and these words mean going down into the water, or immersing. So in the following examples:

Chrysostom, Homil. 40; 1 Cor. i: “To be baptized and to submerge, [kataduesthai.] then to emerge,[anaduein.] is a symbol of descent into the grave, and of ascent from it.” “Basil De Spiritu, c. 15: ‘By three immersions [en trisi katadusesi] and by the like number of invocations, the great mystery of baptism is completed.’” “Damascenus, Orthodox, Fides 4, 10: ‘Baptism is a type of the death of Christ; for by three immersions [katadusen] baptism signifies,’” &c. “So the apostolical constitutions, probably written in the fourth century, Lib. 3, ch. 17: ‘Immersion [katadusis] denotes dying with him, Christ; emersion [anadusis] a resurrection with Christ.’” “Chrysostom, in chap. 3, Johannis: ‘We, as in the sepulchre, immersing [kataduonton] our heads in the water, the old man is buried, and sinking down [kataduskatoto] the whole is concealed at once; then as we emerge, the new
man again rises." "Cyrel, of Jerusalem, uses this language: 'Plunge them [kata duo] down thrice into the water, and raise them up again.'"

Here we perceive kata duo employed in a number of instances to express immersion, which is indeed very remarkable, if baptizo was regarded as a specific term, definitely setting forth the mode. It was not so regarded then, or they would not have called in another term to define the act of baptism. Surely it is here evident that they understood terms entirely different from the immersionists of this age. Who can doubt this?

From this cursory examination into the fact that the Savior and the Apostles could have found other words more explicit than baptizo, we have but become the more established in what we plainly stated in the preceding chapter on the term; inasmuch as we learn from the examples there given, that when the thing was done, the word baptism was applied to name it, which is in perfect keeping with our decided conviction, that the province of baptizo is to point out a thing accomplished, without any definite regard to mode. Here we may well observe, let no man state, with these truths strung out before him, that there is not another word in the Greek language to express immersion, if baptizo be excluded. This we have clearly proved to be an error from the preceding quotations.

But in bringing this chapter to a close, and the point aimed at to a bearing, we shall give an example from the classics, which will evidently establish much of what is said above, when in contrast with examples from the Scriptures. Themistius, Orat. 4, p. 133, says, "The pilot cannot tell but he may save one in the voyage that had better be drowned [baptisai] sunk into the sea." The Savior, in speaking on a subject that involved the same idea, employed katapontisthe to express the act of
drowning. His words are: "It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned [katapontiste] in the depths of the sea." 1 Timothy vi, 9, Paul speaks thus: "They that will be rich fall into hurtful lusts, which drown [buthizus] men in destruction."

Comment here would be useless. The reader can see how the Savior and Paul avoided the use of baptizo in setting forth the idea of dipping or plunging. In short, this aspect of the case leaves the term baptize with us, as if protected by inspiration, to express affusion. If they intended otherwise, is it not an unaccountable matter, that they did not use baptizo to express these acts, which unequivocally express the thought of dipping? Who of the immersing family will meet this, and give a satisfactory reason?

CHAPTER XV.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

In this chapter we shall make our main issue on the term baptizo. Our position is, that pouring, sprinkling, immersing, drowning, washing, and overwhelming were denominated by it, in the past ages, by the lights of the world; and moreover, that it never did, of itself, necessarily express the exact character of any act to which it applied, apart from explanatory words with which it stood connected. This is in perfect harmony with Horsey's declaration: "Baptism is an equivocal, open, general term." Again he gives us this thought, that all that can be determined from it is, "that water should be applied to the subject in some form or other."
We shall now proceed to bring our issue on *baptizo* fairly and plainly before the reader, so that he may judge understandingly between us and those who attach but one meaning to it—immerse; and in doing so, it will be necessary to give their positions, yea, their own words. Dr. Carson says, "My position is, that it [*baptizo*] always signifies to dip; never expressing any thing but mode." Mr. A. Campbell says, "Baptism is not a mode—it is an action. The word that represents it is improperly, by Mr. Carson, called a word of mode. I had the honor of first exposing the sophistry of this word mode. Since 1820, the word action is being substituted for mode." (See his debate with Dr. Rice, p. 96.) Dr. Gale says: "The word, [*baptizo*] perhaps, does not so necessarily express the action of putting under water, as in general a thing being in that condition, no matter how it comes so, whether it is put into the water, or the water comes over it." (See Carson on Baptism, p. 21, from which this quotation is taken.)

The reader will please bear in mind our position, and the positions of these distinguished writers of the immersing family, while he follows us up to, and through, the proofs which this chapter will present—proofs that will, without inference or implication, most conclusively sustain our creed on the word, and most decidedly uproot their wild, narrow, and conflicting opinions.

We said that pouring was expressed by the term *baptizo*. Aurelius Prudentius, A. D. 390, spoke of John as baptizing by pouring water—"*per fundit fluvio*." Paulinus, bishop of Nola, about the same date, represented John as baptizing by pouring water—"*infusis lymphis*." Bernard, when he spoke of the baptism of the Savior by John, said, "The creature poured water on the head of the Creator." We shall now hear Origen, the learned Greek
father, on this point, who says, "How came you to think that Elias, when he should come, would baptize, who did not, in Ahab's time, baptize the wood upon the altar, which was to be washed before it was burnt by the Lord's appearing in fire? But he ordered the priests to do that; not once only, but says, do it the second time; and they did it the second time: and, do it the third time; and they did it the third time. He, therefore, that did not himself baptize then, but assigned that work to others, how was he likely to baptize, when he, according to Malachi's prophecy, should come. (See Wall's Hist. of Inf. Bap., vol. 2, p. 332.) Elijah simply had the wood wet by an act of pouring. (See I Kings xviii, 33.)

Walker, an English writer, who studied the history of baptism with great care, gives us to understand that a man, some sixty or seventy years after the apostles, who became sick in a desert, where there was no water, had sand sprinkled thrice on him for a baptism; and, that when he recovered, and his case was brought before a bishop, the bishop decided he was baptized, "If only water were poured on him." (See Pond, p. 45.) Now, do we not clearly prove, by the highest authority known to the early age of Christianity, that acts of pourings were denominated baptisms? Then, is not the first feature of our position sustained? Who will deny this?

We said that sprinkling was expressed by the term *baptizo*. The previous example shows that the person who sprinkled the sand on the sick man, regarded the act as expressed by the word under investigation. Clemens Alexandrinus, speaking of a backslider that was reclaimed by the apostle John, said: "He was baptized a second time with tears." Athanasius reckoned up eight baptisms, one of which he said was "of tears." Lactantius
used this language: "That he might save the Gentiles by baptism, that is, by the distilling of the purifying dew." We shall now hear Cyprian, bishop of Carthage: "And no man need, therefore, think otherwise, because these sick people, when they receive the grace of our Lord, have nothing but an affusion or sprinkling; when as the Holy Scriptures, by the prophet Ezekiel, says: 'Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you.'" (See Wall's Hist. of Inf. Bap., pp. 357, 358.) It is worthy of remark here, that sixty-six bishops united with Cyprian in the opinion, that sprinkling was expressed by the term *baptizo*. Josephus, speaking of *baptizo*, as found in Luke xi, 38, said, it "seems to be used concerning washing of hands, which was done by sprinkling." Cyprian, when speaking of those who had been baptized by affusion, observed that the parties should not be "baptized again." Now, do we not also prove by the highest authority known to the early age of the church, that acts of sprinklings were called baptisms? Then, is not the second feature of our position sustained? But, should any man dissent from this, let him ask the fathers, and not us, why they so used the word. They prove to us all we desire, and all that is of interest to the church on this question.

We said that *immersion* was expressed by the term *baptizo*. In getting at this sense of the term, we must not only get out of the apostolic age, but out of the Scriptures: for we have no proof of dipping in the days of the apostles, and Dr. Addington well said, "We have not met with one text in the whole Bible that requires the immersion of the whole body." By turning, however, to Pagan writers, we can find this idea attached to the word. Plutarch says, "Then plunging [baptison] himself into the lake Copais." This sustains the third feature of our position, without another word thereon.
We said that *drowning* was expressed by *baptizo*. In proof of this, we shall quote from Dr. Carson's work on baptism, as he is good authority to Baptists, p. 353: "Aristobulus was drowned by it, *[baptizo]*, and Naaman was bathed by it." This sustains the fourth feature in our position very satisfactorily.

We said that *washing* was expressed by *baptizo*. Proof is ample on this point, not from Pagans, but the inspired writers. The king's translators, though under the influence of immersion, give us the word *wash*, as a fit meaning of *baptizo*, in Mark vii, 4, Luke xi, 38, and in Hebrews ix, 10. The reader can refer to these passages; for, of a truth, they sustain the fifth feature of our position, whether we look at them in their English forms, or in their original dress. Justin Martyr, speaking of the mode of baptism, near the days of the apostles, said, "They are washed with water."

We said that *overwhelming* was expressed by the term *baptizo*. Aristotle says, speaking of the Phenicians, "They came to a land uninhabited, whose coast was full of sea weeds, and is not *[baptizesthai]* overflowed at ebb; but when the tide comes in, it is wholly covered." This sustains the sixth feature of our position on the word *baptizo*, evidently showing that it was employed to express, in connection with the previous proofs, the idea of overwhelming, the idea of washing, the idea of drowning, the idea of immersion, the idea of sprinkling, and the idea of pouring.

We also said that *baptizo* never did, of itself, necessarily express the exact character of any act to which it was applied, apart from explanatory words with which it stood connected. This is almost self-evident to the most careless reader, and will therefore only require a few remarks to make it obvious to all. We have proved in this chapter,
that six different meanings were attached to the word at issue, by those who used it, and well knew its proper application, in days past. Now, when we come to an account where it was employed to set forth an act of sprinkling, we find at once by other terms this sense; and were it not for this, we could not tell the intention of the writer. In like manner we are situated, when we meet a narration in which it is used to set forth drowning. It must follow, therefore, that it does not necessarily express the exact character of any act called a baptism, of itself. Thus we sustain the seventh and last feature of our position on the term baptizo. Verily, exclusive dipping, as a mode or act, is an insult to the general character of baptizo.

But, in the face of all the examples before us in the form of testimony, Mr. A. Campbell would vauntingly assert that it (baptizo) signifies “an action;” and Dr. Carson would most lustily contend “that it always signifies to dip, never expressing any thing but mode;” and Dr. Gale would most sagaciously admit, “The word, perhaps, does not so necessarily express the action of putting under water, as in general a thing being in that condition, whether it is put into the water, or the water comes over it.” Here we have a clash of opinions, saddled with contradictions. But, gentle reader, pause a moment, that we may explain fully their views, before we contrast them with our position and the proofs that support it. Campbell means by an act, that a person is taken to the water and plunged therein, not excepting a hair of the head; that it (baptizo) requires this, being “a specific word, and as such can have but one proper, original, and literal meaning.” Carson means by mode, that the person must be entirely dipped in water; that it (baptizo) requires this, “never expressing any thing but mode.” Gale means by a thing being in a
state, that *baptizo* does not so necessarily set forth
dipping, as the subject covered with water.

Well, well! Cyprian and sixty-six bishops, Jose-
phus, and others named in this chapter, may call
acts of pourings or sprinklings baptisms; still,
Campbell will assert that the word only means an
act, dip; and Carson that it only means mode;
immerse; and Gale that it means a thing *covered*
with water. We have quoted from them fairly,
and have fairly represented their positions; and in
view of which we now leave the reader to judge,
from the evidence before him, whether *baptizo* has
only one meaning, or all the significations we at-
tached to it in the outset of this chapter; confident
that he will find our position supported by irresist-
ible facts; and their idea of dip borrowed from the
Pagan writers, who employed it to express all
manner of things, such as *ducking* a man when
swimming, *jumping* into water, an arrow, after
being shot into water, that would scarcely *sink*,
soldiers *plunging* through water up to their waists,
*drowning* a man, *sinking* ships, the *dipping* of the
feet of a flea in melted wax, the *dipping* of hot
iron in water, the partial *sinking* of vessels in wa-
ter, the partial *plunging* of swords in the bodies of
men, the *overflows* of waters, the *overwhelming* of
debts, and the *wetting* of the face of a blister plaster
with breast milk, and so on, and so on. Here we
ask, in the name of all propriety, and the common
understanding of man, how does it happen that
men will pilfer from heathen writers one meaning
of the term, and give it a sort of graduation amid
the fancies of the third century, and then attempt
to impose it on the world as being inseparably con-
ected with a Christian ordinance? .If they must
study the mode of baptism at a Pagan seminary,
why not dip the feet and stop? Did not the term
convey this thought in the dipping of the flea’s
feet? Why not partially dip the body and stop? Was not the term once so used? But this would not do; O, no! it would not serve their purpose, which is to carry out, in part, an unscriptural invention, noticed in the third chapter, an invention that was designated by *kataduo*, and not *baptizo*, by the very ones that practiced it. Let us now, however, proceed to other considerations.

The positions of Campbell, Carson, and Gale, we presume, are not forgotten by the reader. In the order of things, we must first keenly look into Campbell's *act*. It simply means this: if you take a piece of wood, and dip it in water, this is a baptism; but, if you were to cause the water to overflow the wood, he would discard the matter, the dip being wanted; and just right here, he and Gale contradict each other. The next in order is Carson's *mode*. It plainly means this: that if a substance of any kind be plunged into water, this is baptism; but just at this point, he and Campbell differ, the former contending for *mode*, and the latter for an *act*; and moreover, both disagreeing with Gale. Now, we come to take a serious look at Gale's *state*. It amounts to this: that if you take a grain of shot and let it fall into a spoonful of water, this is a baptism; then, on the other hand, if you take the grain of shot, and empty the spoonful of water on it, this too is a baptism; for he says, "The word, perhaps, does not so necessarily express the action of putting under water, as in general a thing being in that condition, whether it is put into the water, or the water comes over it." This certainly looks like abandoning the theory of dipping, and coming over to the doctrine of the application of water to the subject, the doctrine that Justin Martyr, the earliest writer on baptism, presented to the world.

We shall now consider the true office of *baptizo*. 

Our position here is, that the word applied to things that had been done, and called them baptisms, without any definite reference to an exact mode.

In proof of this, we begin with 2 Kings v, 14: "Then went he down, and [ebaptisato] baptized himself seven times in Jordan." The prophet only told him to wash, and this, by the writer of Kings, was called a baptism. "The daughter of Pharaoh came down to wash [epi] at the river." (Ex. ii, 5.) On the same principle that the writer of Kings proceeded in denominating Naaman's washing a baptism, he could have, had he written the history of Pharaoh's daughter, called this act a baptism.

In Ecclesiasticus xxxiv, 25: "He that is [baptizomenos] baptized after touching a dead body, if he touch it again, what is he profited by his washing?" By turning to Numbers xix, 18, and xix, 20, we learn that this baptism consisted in sprinkling, bathing, and washing his clothes; hence it is self-evident that it was the thing completed that was called a baptism, and not the modes that led to this. In Judith xii, 7: "Thus she abode in the camp three days, and went out in the night into the valley of Bethulia, and[ebaptisato epi, baptized at, or] washed herself at a fountain of water." Is not the term here used solely to name the thing which had been done, without any definite respect to mode? The man who can believe that she plunged herself in the fountain, when the account says she baptized or washed at a fountain, ought not to have his faith envied.

In Mark vii, 4, Luke xi, 38, and Hebrews ix, 10, baptizoontai, baptismous, ebaptisthee, and baptismois are found designating washings and sprinklings; still they were not employed to express precisely modes.

In Hebrews vi, 2: "Of the doctrine of baptisms," Here, too, the term is employed to point out or
name things, without any definite reference to modes.

1 Corinthians x: “And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.” The dew or drops from the cloud, and spray of the ocean, that fell on the people of Israel, is called a baptism: still, as it regards the exact mode, the word was not used to express it, but to call the circumstance a baptism.

Cyprian so used the term; for he called affusion a baptism, and washing a baptism. The thing accomplished was what he applied the word to. He would have called immersion a baptism, pouring a baptism, sprinkling a baptism, in the same paragraph, had circumstances called him out.

Origen so used the term; for he called the wetting of the wood on the altar a baptism. The act was what he aimed at, and not mode, though the mode is understood by his detailed description.

Irenæus so used the term; for he spoke of Christians as “baptizing by an affusion of water mixed with oil.” The act was what he set forth by the word, and nothing more. The mode is expressed by other words in the quotation.

The Council of Carthage so used the term, and so did the Council of Neocæsarea. The Council of Trent decided thus: “Those that are baptized, are either plunged into the water, or water is poured on them, or they are sprinkled with water: now, whichever of these ways is observed, we ought to believe the baptism to be valid.” This council, it will be perceived, used the word apart from any exclusive mode, calling the application of water to the person, or the person to the water, a baptism. This is a princely illustration of our position on the office of *baptizo*.

Damascene called Noah’s flood “a baptism.” Surely he did not intend, by the use of the word,
mode, but the thing accomplished. The mode, however, is directly unfavorable to immersion. Did not the fountains of the deep flow up on the land? And was not the rain poured forth out of the windows of heaven? In either case the water came on the world, which favors affusions. The world was not plunged into water. We repeat, however, that the act was what was intended, and not the mode.

Tertullian called it "the baptism of the world." All the previous thoughts, on the same case, apply here.

We trust the reader is now satisfied that we have sustained our position on the office of *baptizō*, that it calls acts baptisms, without any definite reference to the exact modes involved; and moreover, that this, when taken in connection with our previous proof, in the beginning of this chapter, will leave him fully satisfied on the doctrine of affusion in baptism, the only plain doctrine of the Scriptures.

---

CHAPTER XVI.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Well, as we purpose to begin with the next chapter an English argument, purely of a Scriptural character, and have some considerations to notice in this of interest, we shall begin by remarking that it is as natural for an immersionist to think of *dip* when he sees *bap*, as to think of light when he speaks of day. Hear how Campbell, who declares "wherever there is *bap* there is *dip,*" speaks for all on this subject. "I most conscientiously avow my conviction, that he who has not been immersed in
water into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy
Ghost, has never received Christian baptism. All
Baptists believe this.” (See his Debate with Dr.
Rice, p. 257.) To this we reply, that the holy men
of God thought otherwise and talked otherwise,
who lived near the time of the apostles. This can
easily be perceived by turning back to our last—
The proof there is infallible on this point.

But after all the evidence we have produced
from the classics, the Scriptures, and the fathers, to
show that the application of water to a subject, in
any form, can be and ever was, called a baptism,
the immersionist stands before us a chained slave
to his water idol. In short, the man that follow-
ed the Armagh coach to Dublin, Ireland, could see
no reason why the great wheels should not over-
take the little ones; and so we may speak of eve-
ry exclusive immersionist, for when the *bap ap-
ppears he can see no reason why it should not find
water, even in a jail, a city, a private house, and
present a total immersion.

Men of this stamp are hopeless. Men that will
so speak and so write are beyond the influence of
reason, wedded to one of the most absurd theories
that ever was unfolded to the eye of the world.—
Do we doubt this? If so, look at the above avow-
al of Campbell, and doubt will give place to an
abiding conviction of the truth of what we have
just stated. But the next thing in order that meets
us is a declaration made by Carson, not much in-
ferior in point of absurdity to the one we have
 glanced at made by Campbell. Hear it, and re-
lect while you hear: “I deny that *eis signifies at—
I maintain that it never has this signification.”
Why all this? Ah! gentle reader, we shall let you
into the secret, which is this, *eis is the word em-
ployed to put the eunuch into the water, and it
must be so construed as to signify into, not to or at.
To let it get the sense of _at_ would, to the understanding of the immersionist, be opening a door to a latitude in the meaning ruinous to his cause; hence he boldly affirms "that _eis_ never signifies _at_." And this, with many Baptists, passes for law and gospel. Now, let us place alongside of this the declaration of inspiration: "And they repented _eis_ at the preaching of Jonas." This needs no comment. It is, of itself, sufficient to make the pale face of immersion, as now advocated, blush. But while on this feature we shall remark, that we made it appear by a statement carefully recorded in another chapter, that _eis_ occurs eleven times in the eighth chapter, of the Acts of the Apostles, and is only translated once _into_, in the case of the eunuch's baptism by Philip. We then intimated that this fact gave us evidence of the influence of trine immersion on the minds of the king's translators—a thing that cannot be doubted by any reading unbiased man. We also then remarked that _eis_ was generally connected with another word, when motion into a place was intended. And just right here we shall disclose this fact, that while _eis_ is found single eleven times in the above mentioned chapter, it is found allied to a word in the third verse, to denote an action into a place. Is this not a remarkable fact, to be found in such a connection? Will not this shed a flood of light on what we have said on the eunuch's baptism, as to the intention of Luke in showing where it took place. The account runs thus: "As for Saul he made havoc of the church, _eisporeuomenos_, entering into every house." Thus we have, in the eighth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, _eis_ used twelve times, once with another word to set forth an action into a place, and eleven times without any such connection, to express an action _to_, &c.—The reader will please keep this in mind, and al-
ways think of it, when he hears a Baptist minister emphasize on the words, *into the water*.

We shall now make a few remarks on the impossibility of John immersing all the Scriptures send to his baptism, as it will open up the way for some reflections, that could not, consistently with our contemplated plan, be introduced in any future chapter. Carson felt the force of this objection, and labored to break the force of the blow. He speaks thus on the point: "There is no necessity to suppose that John baptized all personally. He might have employed the instrumentality of others along with himself." (See his work on Baptism, p. 335.) The Scriptures, without human supposition or calculation, emphatically represent John as having baptized immense numbers of people. This cannot be doubted. No wonder then that Carson provides him assistance! In the language of Carson, though for a different purpose, we would say that there is no necessity to fix a mode to his baptism that will make the work assigned to him impossible, or to drive him from necessity to call in help. Give him the mode of sprinkling or pouring, and all difficulty is at an end.

The way being now clearly opened for our thoughts, we take occasion to state here, without details, that immersion was not required by the law of Moses, so far as we can learn; and moreover, that Moses did do an act that John may have taken as a precedent. The act is thus spoken of, Hebrews ix, 19: "For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people, according to the law, he took the blood of calves and goats, with water and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and the people." He simply took a bunch of hyssop and bound it together with threads made of scarlet wool, then dipped it in a basin which contained the blood and water, and sprinkled the mix-
ed fluid on the people. Thus he baptized them with great facility. We shall here add, that the number baptized by Moses would amount to about as many as John baptized, judging from the facts recorded in both cases. We say that Moses baptized them; and our authority for this is found in Hebrews ix, 10, where we learn that all the ablutions of the Jewish people are significantly called divers baptismis, divers baptisms. The same authority in another place speaks of them as being baptized with the ocean’s spray, and with the dew or water from a cloud.

Now, may not John have done as Moses did?—Was not the precedent worthy of being followed? It is probable he followed it in some cases, though we would not venture to state he did. When he had large assemblies to baptize, if he carried out the procedure of Moses, his work was easily, solemnly, and Scripturally accomplished. If we apply his own words to this supposition, we shall be the more favorably impressed with its reasonableness. His words are: “I indeed baptize you with water; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.” If he used the bunch of hyssop, and acted as Moses did, he dipped it in water, and then sprinkled the water on the penitent and confessing multitude.—Before the water passed into the act of baptism, it presented the idea of oneness, but the moment it passed into the completion of baptism, a portion of it visibly rested on each of the subjects. Now, by this view of the matter we could have a striking comment on John’s declaration, “I indeed baptize you with water.” Of a truth, before the Holy Ghost virtually passed into the fullness of baptism, on the day of Pentecost, it revealed a oneness; but the moment it passed into a complete baptism, a portion of its influence visibly appeared on each of the disciples. How clumsy, awkward, and un-
meaning immersion is found here! But how appropriate and significant affusion! It would not be a stretch of fancy, whether thus baptized, or baptized by having water poured on their heads, to regard the visible water on their heads, after baptism, as representing the visible influence of the Holy Spirit resting on the heads of the disciples on the day of Pentecost. This, we are sure, looks much more reasonable than all we have ever heard said or sung about a "watery grave," and a dripping body coming up therefrom.

Since we first formed these opinions, we met with some thoughts worthy of insertion in this connection. Dr. Guise says, "It seems to me that the people stood in ranks near to or just within the edge of the river, and John passing along before them cast water upon their heads or faces with his hands, or some proper instrument; by which means he might easily baptize many thousand in a day." Horsey says, "I presume that the multitude stood in ranks, at the brink, or just within the edge of the river, while the administrator sprinkled or poured the running water on them." A. Hall gives Dr. Guise's note a full sanction.

Now, we know that a Baptist can smile at all this, and pronounce the whole ludicrous: but we would solemnly ask him to pause for a moment, and then ask himself before his Maker, "Would I have smiled at Moses, and looked on his act as ludicrous, when he sprinkled both the book and the people?" It does appear to us that he who would disrespectfully and irreverently smile at affusion in John's baptism, might with the same propriety smile at affusion in the baptism by Moses.

We shall now remark, that we do not lay any particular stress on the exact manner of John's procedure, as it regards the implements he used to apply water to the subjects; for, whether he bap-
tized the people occasionally collectively, when vast numbers were present, or baptized always separately, the case is the same to us; because he informs us, "I indeed baptize with water," which, of course, sets forth affusion, no matter how he applied it. It is much more natural, however, to suppose he baptized large assemblies, when waiting for baptism, as Moses sprinkled the book and the people, than by pouring water on each singly; and it is much more natural to think he baptized by pouring water on the head, when only a few were present, than by sprinkling.

But let us turn our thoughts from these reflections to the self-evident meaning of baptizo, as understood by John. We most solemnly record our conviction here, that, if the word had ever expressed a total immersion up to the days of John, wherever and however employed, which it did not, the attitude in which he then placed it, as a substitute for Joel's word pour, would have excluded this signification; for whatever may be the native sense of a word, the moment it represents another term, it drops its native import and speaks the language of the term it represents. John threw it into the hands of Peter in this character, who took particular notice of its office in this connection by saying, "This"—the baptism of which John spoke—"is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh." Here we ask no inference, no reasoning by analogy, but the plain attitude and development of the word, literally expressed by the idea of pouring. This is a most troublesome affair to immersionists. It makes their ingenuity groan under the burden of its plain practical sense. Hear how Booth labors to meet this: "It was in such a manner and to such a degree, that they [the disciples] were like a patient in the electrical bath, as if immersed in it." Is not
this a fine turn of fancy? But it is certainly very poor theology. Booth, to have some showing for the claim of immersion here must convert the Spirit into something in the form of an electrical bath; for immersed they must be, nothing less will do. Well, we suppose the electrical bath was the sound that filled the house; but it so happened that the sound came on them, which is entirely fatal to immersion, which would have required them to have been taken and plunged into the sound, which is really an insult to the understanding of men. The English reader, however, will see that the term *sound* is the antecedent to *it*. The word in the original for sound is *echos*, which signifies a reverberating noise. So all this flourish of sophistry on the part of Booth, is about a simple *echo*. This, it will be seen, went before the actual baptism of the disciples. It was but the signal of the Spirit's approach.

We repeat that this is a very troublesome subject to immersionists. We saw, a few years ago, an article from the pen of a professor of theology in a Baptist seminary, on this point, which amounted to this: "That the Spirit fell on the floor where the disciples were, and rose up around them like a flame of fire, the top resembling tongues of fire, and so they were immersed." Is not this a shameful trifling with solemn things?

We hope the mind of the reader is now prepared to hear, and to receive, an English exposition of the mode of baptism, entirely based on the established version of the Scriptures. This, as we have already mentioned, we shall begin with our next chapter.

But before we conclude this we have a few remarks to make to immersionists. They inform the public that all the examples from the classics, where *baptizo* is employed, establish immersion.—
Now, if they mean by this that the examples that could be taken from classic writers establish their idea of immersion, a total plunging of things in water, and then a lifting up, we deny it, and here assert, that we can produce fifteen to one against them; and moveover, we assert that even bapto, though employed a great number of times in the Scriptures, does not express a total immersion, in any one case that we can call to mind. Any how, we shall undertake to show, that it is against total immersion at the rate of fifteen to one. Now, in the spirit of candor and truth, we invite attention to these considerations. They are not, as here spoken of, based on any definite calculation, but we know we can sustain them, having kept inside of the limits of facts. Immersionists, total immersionists, one and all, may we indulge the hope of hearing from you on the points immediately preceding? We shall patiently wait.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

In this chapter, right here, we begin an English argument, for the English reader, on the mode of baptism. We shall, in pursuance of this, soon see whether immersion or affusion is the doctrine of the New Testament. Baptists pretend to preach and write as if they were calmly satisfied that the English Scriptures justified their views; but their far-seeing ones know better, and much desire a change, feeling mental reservation a severe cross to bear. They also preach and write as if they placed no stress on the prepositions in and into. The term baptize is their main reliance, if
you now listen to their preaching, and read their works, believing that they are as candid as sincere. The truth of the matter is, though they have been driven from all convincing reliance on these prepositions, and forced to conduct the controversy on the import of the term baptize, still, in heart, they cling to *in* and *into*, with strong devotion.—When they read of John baptizing *in* Jordan, what a clear vision they have of immersion! And when they read of Philip and the eunuch going down *into* the water, what a strong proof arises before their minds of a total immersion of the whole body of the eunuch in water!

Now, if we invite their attention to the scriptural fact, that John baptized *in* the wilderness, and *in* a place called Bethabara, and *in* Enon, how they swell the meaning of the little word *in*, and make it to signify that John baptized *in* the river Jordan, though the voice of inspiration says *in* the wilderness, *in* Bethabara, *in* Enon! We think some strictures on the import of these prepositions, especially on *in*, will be found interesting to the reader, and show the fallacy of the whole argument of the immersing family on these terms.

Here we give a rule by which the meaning of *in* may be ascertained, no matter where used in the Scriptures; namely, that it presupposes an action perfected or accomplished within certain limits, being connected with a verb, this sense being clearly fixed by circumstances with which it stands connected. Let us try this rule: "Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judaea, in the days of Herod the King." (Matthew ii, 1.) *In* Bethlehem. Does not *in* here mean that an occurrence took place within the limits or boundaries of a city called Bethlehem? *In* the days of Herod. Does not *in* here signify that the birth of a child happened
within the limits of the reign of King Herod? 12th verse: "And being warned of God in a dream." In a dream. Does not in here specify an act within the limits of a certain communication made to the minds of the wise men of the East in reference to their action toward Herod? 22d verse: "But when he heard that Archelaus did reign in Judea." In Judea. Does not in here signify that a certain personage ruled within the limits of the country called Judea? 23d verse: "And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth." In a city. Does not in here signify that a specified individual went and took up his abode within the limits of a city called Nazareth?

"In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea." (Matthew iii, 1.) In those days. Does not in here mean that John came preaching within the limits of certain days previously set forth, and here referred to? In the wilderness of Judea. Does not in here mean that John proclaimed the baptism of repentance within the limits of a portion of the country called the wilderness of Judea? 3d verse: "Crying in the wilderness." The same meaning here. 6th verse: "And were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." In Jordan. Does not in here signify that an act was done within the limits of the channel of Jordan, irrespective of any particular spot?

A remark here, before we turn to Mark. It will be perceived that we are fixing the true signification of in, apart from all connection with the original term. From the facts now before us, we clearly see that all the previous actions occurred within the limits of places and times, without respect to any definite parts of the places, or definite points of the times. He dwelt in a city called Nazareth—simply within the limits of the city. And were baptized of him in Jordan—simply within the
limits of the channel of the Jordan, which, according to Maundrell, had one furlong of a level strand between the outermost bank and the innermost, over which you must walk before you reach the regular bank of the river; hence, any action that was accomplished in what was called the bed of the Jordan at high water, might properly be regarded as effected in Jordan, it being as evidently within its bounds as the residence within the bounds of the city.

Let us now turn to Mark i, 2: "As it is written in the prophets." In the prophets. Does not in here signify that a certain transaction was written within the limits of the works of the prophets? 3d verse: "The voice of one crying in the wilderness." In the wilderness. Does not in here mean, as we have already noticed, that this act took place within the limits of the wilderness? 4th verse: "John did baptize in the wilderness." In the wilderness. Does not in here mean that John performed a certain act, called a baptism, within the limits of the wilderness, which must, in the nature of things, have been carried into effect on dry land? 5th verse: "And were baptized of him in the river Jordan." In the river Jordan. Does not in here mean that when John baptized the multitudes, the act was accomplished within the limits of the channel of Jordan?

A remark here, before we turn to Luke. From the facts before us from Mark, we are forced to the conclusion that John first baptized in the wilderness, on dry land, and then in the channel of Jordan on dry land; and that the word in practically in these places has the import of the word on. To make this plain, we say, "that the Methodists baptized a great number in the old field where they held their camp meeting." Now, does not a child perceive that in here has direct reference to the
limits of the field, that the action was done on the ground, and not in the ground? Again, he walked in the garden. Does not in here signify within the limits of the garden, but that the action was on the soil of the garden? In like manner we must understand the declarations that John baptized in the wilderness and in Jordan. The coloring is given to in by the limits of these places, while in reality the import, so far as the action was involved, is that of on. On the soil of the wilderness, on the strand of the channel of the Jordan. This is clear, striking, and convincing.

Let us now turn to Luke i, 80: "And was in the deserts, till the day of his showing unto Israel." In the deserts. Does not in here mean that a certain personage was within the limits of places called deserts, for a specified time? Luke ii, 8: "And there were in the same country shepherds abiding in the field." In the same country, in the field. Does not in here signify that certain persons were within the limits of certain places at a given time? Here, as in the previous examples, we find our rule of judging holding good, in showing that the term in is limited to a signification arising out of the bounds of places and of time.

Let us now turn to John i, 23: "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness." In the wilderness. Does not in here show that John designates the general platform of his preaching, where he baptized some according to Mark's testimony? 28th verse: "These things were done in Bethabara, beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing." In Bethabara. Does not in here clearly show that John baptized within the limits of a place called Bethabara? Bethabara, it is true, was situated in that portion of country called a wilderness, but when an act was accomplished in it, the affair was spoken of as taking place within
its limits, and not one inch beyond it. Now, if a
transaction takes place one breadth of a finger be-
yond the corporate limits of a city, the matter can-
not be made out as occurring within the city.
John, therefore, baptized within the exact bounds
of a place called Bethabara, so far as his action is
noticed in this passage. In the river, that is, within
the limits of its channel. In the wilderness, that
is, within the limits of the wilderness. In Betha-
bara, that is, within the limits of a place called
Bethabara.

To illustrate, we shall say, "It was said in the
field, in the yard, in the house." Does not the use
of *in* here show that the thing spoken of took place
at three different places; and that the occurrence
was on in reality, and not in, the latter term bor-
rowing its position from the limits of the field, the
limits of the yard, the limits of the house. So
much, then, for the preposition *in*, and so much for
the errors of immersionists when speaking of it and
writing on it.

This is not a novel view of the matter. Hear
the truly learned Watson: "And when within the
bed of the stream, he might as truly be said to be
in the river, when mere *place* was the principal
thing to be pointed out, as if he had been immersed
in the water." Are we not then in fine company?

But what will immersionists say should we prove
all we here contend for by the first Baptist writer
in the world?

Please hear how plainly he talks on this point:
"Instead of keeping John the Baptist ten hours
every day in the water, I will not oblige him to go
into the water at all: he might have stood on the
bank." In speaking of the words *in the river*, as
applied to another person, he says: "He might
have been in the river, yet not in the water: all within the banks is the river.” (Carson on Bap., pp. 336-7, 339.)

All within, within the banks, is the river. Comment here is needless. This is how Carson helps along our interpretation, and makes it palatable to the immersionist.

Now, do we not prove by Carson every thing that we contend for here? The baptism of John then took place by the river Jordan, in its channel, on dry ground, and of course by affusion.

The preposition into will only require a passing notice, its office being made so plain by the previous explanations on in. Into the wilderness, into a tree, into a mountain. Here, as in baptism, it merely refers to place; hence we state most positively that it makes no difference where Philip baptized, nor where John baptized, place being one thing, but mode quite a different matter. John baptized with water, and so did Philip, there being nothing in the word in or into to forbid this—the words only referring to place, as already noticed. When place is spoken of, we find in and into; but when mode is spoken of, which we shall particularly examine in our next, the word with is always presented. See Chapter X, on into.
CHAPTER XVIII.
THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

The reader is in possession of our views and arguments on the import and application of the term in, as set forth in the narrations of John's baptism; for in our last we brought this matter clearly up, and presented the whole in a garb easily to be comprehended by all. In a word, we made it incontrovertibly evident that in, as used in the accounts given of John's baptism, simply signifies that an act was done by him, called a baptism, within the limits of a place called Jordan, and within the limits of a place called the wilderness, and also within the limits of Bethabara and Enon. In view of this, it will be found self-evident, if an immersionist should insist that John did baptize exactly in the water of Jordan, because in is used, the consequence will be, by a similar dogmatic position, that John baptized exactly in the soil of the wilderness, in the soil of Enon, and in the streets or floors of the town of Bethabara, because in is employed to express his baptisms at these points. This cannot be resisted nor denied; inasmuch as the account runs thus: he baptized in Jordan, in the wilderness, in Enon, in Bethabara. Now, fix to in the meaning attached to it in our last, that is, within the limits of these places, and the whole is perfectly plain, and the sense striking. To illustrate this, we shall say that a murder was committed in Tennessee, another in Alabama, and another in Mississippi. By this form of speech, we only speak of the places where these murders were perpetrated, without any reference to the mode of any one of them. Can any other signification be attached to such a statement? We
answer, no. Well, this being self-apparent, we shall proceed by saying, that the murder was done in Tennessee with a rock, the murder in Alabama with a club, and the murder in Mississippi with a knife. Here we make a pause, to ask, is it not clearly evident that this form of speech sets forth the mode of the murder, and the agents used? These illustrations must ably show the reader, that when John's baptism is spoken of in reference to the places, the word in is always used, but, when spoken of in reference to mode, the word with is always used. The statements about the murders in the above States, where in is employed, do not directly or indirectly express the mode of these murders; but the statements, where with is employed directly do. In like manner we are to understand the history of John's baptism. We lay great emphasis on this; for, had this been attended to, great confusion of thought, in confounding the statements on the place with the statement on the mode, might have always been avoided; and, if now attended to, the inquirer after truth may forever keep from error, and be perfectly satisfied that where in is used, in the account of John's baptism, the place is only pointed out, and that where with is used in this account, the mode is evidently expressed. How plain! Still the perception of an immersionist will magnify.

To add force to this, we remark, to baptize in water is to make water a passive agent, and the person the object put into it; but to baptize with water, is to make man the passive object, and water the agent used in the act. How then did it ever get into the heads of men that John immersed in water, when it is said at every point that he baptized with water? We almost feel like being compelled here to exclaim, O, the depths of the incongruity of man's reasoning and perception!
To baptize *with* water is one thing, but to baptize *in* water is quite a different thing; hence we are forced to reiterate our conviction, that it is a matter of surprise how any reader of the English Testament should have ever thought of immersion in the case of John's baptism, when it is explicitly said, in every place, that he baptized with water, when speaking of mode, but never in water. Let it be distinctly understood that wherever the mode or manner of John's baptism is spoken of in the New Testament, the word *in* is never used, but the word *with* ever, and facts and faith will be found right—exactly right. Our conclusion from these reflections is, that it would be as reasonable to infer the mode of the murders named, because *in* is employed to designate the places, as to infer the mode of John's baptism, because *in* is used to locate the points at which he labored; and that he who cannot see affusion in John's baptism, could not see affusion in this statement—the lady wet her flowers *with* water. In short, he that can squeeze immersion, having the English Testament before him, out of John's baptism, when it is said he baptized with water, not *in* water, could easily squeeze immersion out of the statement we make concerning the wetting of the flowers *with* water, making it appear, from some strange charm about the word *wet*, as around the word *baptize*, that she virtually plunged the flowers in the water. The common sense of mankind, however, will remain satisfied with this idea, that when it is said John baptized *with* water, no matter whether in Jordan, in the wilderness, or in Bethabara, he applied the water to the subjects in the form of affusion, and in no other way.

It may be asked here, how are we satisfied that John baptized by affusion in every instance, seeing it is said that Jesus after he *was* baptized went
straightway up out of the water, and that he baptized at Enon, because there was much water there? The reader will perceive that in the case of the Savior's baptism by John, the word *in* is not used, and that we have disposed of this term as used in the account of John's action while at Enon, by proving that it signifies that he did what is placed to his account *within* the bounds of a place designated Enon. We unhesitatingly reply, that if it had been recorded that he baptized all in the river Jordan, still the doctrine of affusion would be evident, and triumphant, from the facts that we have already presented, that he baptized with water ever, and never in water. We almost fear we shall here be misunderstood. We mean to say most distinctly and emphatically, that the Scriptures always speak of John baptizing with water, when speaking of his mode, but never in water. Need we repeat that *in* is always used when the place is set forth, but *with* when mode is spoken of?

How the aspect of words may be misunderstood! Jesus went up straightway out of the water, hence the opinion that he was immersed. Well, let John speak for himself at this point: "I indeed baptize with water:" hence he baptized the Savior with water, by affusion, not in water, the doctrine of immersion. We assert, and re-assert, with the Bible before us, that John baptized the Savior with water, and not in water. We have no objection to the Savior being regarded as standing in the edge of the waters of Jordan, John baptizing him with water; but we have unwavering objections to the doctrine that John immersed him in water, the Scriptures declaring that John always baptized with water. The word *with* is the pillar of our faith here. How sure and imposing the foundation!

The words *out of*, as used in the account of our
Lord's baptism, in the language of Ripley, a Baptist writer, "furnish no decision in respect to the meaning of the ordinance." It would be useless to dwell on these words, as our position is, whether John baptized in Jordan, or on the banks, that he baptized with water. Cannot we press this idea on the mind of the immersionist, by reminding him that while he contends that John baptized the Savior by immersion, he is found at war with John, who assures us, "I baptize with water." But we are brought to a pause here. Is it not a useless task to speak to men who cannot distinguish between baptizing with water and in water?

As we are now on the principal points at issue, and confined to an English argument, we refer the reader to Chapter X, for the true position of the word represented by out of in our Lord's baptism.

So far as this baptism is concerned, the truth would seem thus,—that he underwent a baptismal washing, standing in the edge of Jordan, by which he became a legal antitypical priest, fulfilling the law of righteousness, bearing on him from the days of Aaron, in a most impressive light, till then. Well did St. Bernard say, "The creature poured water on the head of the Creator." This was the understanding the early churches had of his baptism, as may be seen by reference to figures of representation there found, before any of the present denominations had a name. (See the original term used in Chapter IX, to express the place of our Lord's baptism, also cut No. 1, at the end of this work.)

It remains for us here to notice the baptism by John in Enon, because of much water. To this our attention is turned by a question in this chapter. It is said that the words much water are infallible proof of immersion; but here we make the issue, that the words much water are an infallible proof against immersion, and show, beyond the
possibility of a doubt, that they were introduced for a different purpose than that of setting forth the idea of John going to hunt up much water to immerse men and women. Pray, what did John want with much water to immerse an individual? Would not a pond 20 feet by 12, or less, have done? Certainly. Can any man then in his sober reason show us what John wanted with much water in case immersion was his object? He cannot. The truth is, he did not want much water to baptize by immersion; yet no attitude would have suited him, nor met the wants of the Jewish people, except a place abounding with water. The reason is obvious, and runs thus: The Jewish people would not eat without first washing their hands; nor is this all, since we find by turning to Mark vii, 3, 4, that they washed or baptized their cups, pots, and beds. Here we see why John went to a place of many waters. Had he been at a place devoid of water to serve the demands of the Jews, they would have suddenly left for their homes, as they would not have eaten without first washing their hands. This accounts for the fact of John going to a place of much water, and no other reasonable account can be given. In short, it is quite satisfactory to our mind that the very mention of the words much water is calculated to drive us to seek for a meaning beyond immersion,—even the meaning, the exact meaning, we have given above.

Surely when it can be made appear that John wanted much water for the purpose of immersion, it will be time enough to go into detail on the reverse principle; but as this cannot be done, hence the foolishness of an argument based thereon, and of all anticipations and replies thereto. But in disposing of our arguments on John's baptism we would here remark, that we proved that the word in simply means he baptized within the limits of
the channel of Jordan, within the limits of the wilderness, and within the limits of Bethabara, also within the limits of Enon; that the Scriptures always speak of him as having baptized with water, when presenting his mode, but never in water; and that the fact of John baptizing at Enon because there was much water there, establishes another fact, that he did not want much water for the purpose of immersion, but for the purpose of meeting the wants of a people who baptized their hands, cups, tables, and pots, continually. So much then for John's baptism, and for the doctrine of baptism by affusion. Immersion finds no encouragement here. In excludes it, and much water frowns on it. We do remember with Peter the word of the Lord, how John did baptize with water. This is enough for us. (See cut No. 3, at the end of this work.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

In Chapter XVII, and also in Chapter XVIII, we turned the careful attention of the reader to the Scriptural fact, that where baptism is spoken of in reference to place, the term in is always used, but where spoken of in reference to mode, the term with is ever employed. In the course of these chapters we made it evident, that there is a world of difference between baptizing with water and in water; that to baptize with water is to apply it to the subject; and that to baptize in water is to apply the subject to the water by plunging or dipping. The reader will please keep in mind these necessary distinctions, when reading the Scriptures, and
above all this leading one, that the true sign of the places of baptism is *in*, which never expresses the mode of the action; and that the true sign of the mode of baptism is *with*, which is ever expressive of the manner of the act, but never of the place. In the light of these undeniable and irresistible truths, we found that John baptized in the channel of the Jordan, or in Jordan, in the wilderness, in Bethabara, and in Enon; and moreover, that it makes no difference where he baptized, whether in a river, in the ocean, or on the house-top, or on the mountain summit, inasmuch as the Scriptures assure us that he baptized with water. Now, go and read the New Testament with these clear and striking distinctions before your minds, and you will not only be satisfied that immersion is neither made probable nor possible, but that many have confounded the place of John’s baptism with his mode, the fruitful cause of all the confusion of thought on this question, though the direct teachings of inspiration distinctly keep them apart, and speak of them as if to guard the student of theology against the fatal and erroneous doctrine of their unity.

In proceeding from this point of our investigation, we would remark, that we have no objection to the idea of carrying the manner of John’s baptism, in part, into the Christian dispensation, but have every objection to it being taken as a perfect model, by which the apostles acted. Robert Hall, a strict advocate for immersion, could easily perceive that John’s baptism was not exactly in accordance with the formula presented by the Savior. John baptized unto repentance; but the apostles baptized all in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, excepting the proselytes of John, or members of the Jewish state of the church, who were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, or
Jesus Christ, terms that do not include the Trinity. This will be noticed in Chapter XXII, and the reasons assigned.

Here we have the difference. All men ought to perceive it. We said a moment ago that we had no objection to the idea of carrying the manner of John’s baptism, in part, into the Christian state of the church. By this we mean his blending repentance with the application of water to the subject; for in reference to the latter, which we heartily subscribe to, he speaks for himself thus: “I indeed baptize you with water: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.” These considerations, when summed up, set forth vital distinctions, which ought to be carefully noted by every Bible reader. Affusion, however, is the principal idea embodied in their tendency.

Now, as our position is as plain as our procedure of reasoning, we shall, without another word of explanation, invite the attention of the reader to the celebrated baptism of the eunuch by Philip. The narration of this event runs thus,—that both went down into the water, and that after the completion of the baptism, they went up out of the water. The question, of course, is, was the eunuch immersed by Philip? Or was he subjected to the process of baptism by affusion? Immersionists may infer, do infer, that he was baptized by immersion. We say infer; for there is no proof beyond an unwarrantable inference. We, while defending our side of the question, exclude inference—needing it not; and in view of which we make here an issue with the immersionist of no ordinary character, that is, that we shall test the mode of the baptism of the eunuch by the exact mode of John’s baptism, as above stated by himself, promising to abide by the result. John says he baptized with water, and Peter and Luke say
John baptized with water, which cause us to assert that the eunuch was so baptized, going on the principle that Philip acted as John did in this matter. Here then we have this affair settled, forever settled, if we go by the Bible; for the eunuch evidently was baptized with water, according to this mode of reasoning, and not in water. Now, if there were one place in the New Testament setting forth the idea, when speaking of John’s baptism in reference to manner, that he baptized in water, the immersionist might, with some show of reason, infer that the eunuch was baptized by immersion; but as there is no place so speaking, or so intimating even remotely, he has no right to infer, in any sense, shape, or form, that the eunuch was baptized by immersion. But after all this, if the immersionist will have it that the eunuch was immersed in water, let him; but it will be at the expense of contradicting the oneness of John’s procedure with Philip’s, the former giving us to know that he baptized with water, not in water. This is the statement of the Book on the matter, whether it be believed or rejected. Immersionists pretend to go by the Book, and to this we keep them. Our argument now is purely an English one; and the reader can plainly perceive therefrom that if Philip baptized as John did, he baptized the eunuch with water. How immersionists can read the Scriptures, and see that John baptized in every instance with water, and withal have it that he immersed in water, is a point that baffles our conception; but when they plainly contend that the apostles baptized as John did, they are but consistent with themselves, though it be just at the expense of sacrificing a great truth, John baptizing with water. The reader will discover that we follow the plain, common sense teaching of the English translation in these thoughts, and
that as the Scriptures state that John baptized with water, we are bound to subscribe to the doctrine of affusion, and go to the place where Philip baptized the eunuch to find a similar baptism, a baptism *with water*, not in water. It is worthy of notice here, circumstance as Philip and the eunuch were then, apart, from vessels, churches, and suitable accommodations, that they had to go down into the water, that is, into the edge of the water, to carry into effect baptism. We pause here, however, to record the fact, that if Philip and the eunuch went into the water, so that it reached their chins, and Philip baptized as John did, the case was not thereby altered; he baptized with water. The truth is, if Philip baptized at the water's edge, he baptized with water; and if he baptized, standing in a greater depth of water than any immersionist has ever been in, still he baptized with water. Need we here again inform the reader that we are arguing on the principle that Philip baptized, so far as the application of water was concerned, as John did? This is obvious—too obvious to be mistaken; and the conviction therefrom is overwhelming in our favor, and fatal to every idea of immersion, whether we refer to the action of John, as stated by himself, or to the account of the eunuch's baptism by Philip. (See cut No. 2, at the end of this work; it well illustrates all this.

Perhaps it would be well to state here that the Scriptures do not leave the mode of baptism subject to the caprice of inference. This cannot be too much insisted on. We are willing to admit, however, that if men confound the places of baptism, as expressed by *in*, with the mode of baptism, as set forth by *with*, they are at once out on the ocean of inference, without chart, compass, or pilot; but if they keep free of this, and follow up
and out the exact statements of inspiration, they will ever find that the mode of baptism is kept entirely separate from the place, and made clear, positive, and impressive. Is it not surpassingly strange to hear a man reason thus: John baptized in Jordan; therefore he baptized by immersion? Most assuredly. Now, let us follow up this plan of viewing the matter, and we shall find the results as follows: John baptized in the wilderness; therefore he baptized by immersion: John baptized in Bethabara; therefore he baptized by immersion; and John baptized in Enon, much water being there; therefore he baptized by immersion. This is the work of inference, and how ridiculously absurd! To show up this mode of reasoning in its most deformed character, we have only to say: John baptized in the wilderness; therefore he baptized by affusion: John baptized in Bethabara; therefore he baptized by affusion; and John baptized in Enon; therefore he baptized by affusion; and in Jordan; therefore he baptized by affusion. We say of this, as of the other mode of reasoning, of which this is an exact copy, how ridiculously absurd! Now, abandon this course of procedure, and view things as already expressed by us, and all will be plain; and all the baptisms of the New Testament resolve themselves into the doctrine of affusion, the plain doctrine of the Bible.

In bringing this chapter to a close, we deem it necessary to present in a few words our conclusions on the terms, in, into, and with.

1. Wherever in is found associated with baptism, when place is the idea to be conveyed, we are to understand it as only signifying that the act was done within certain limits; and that in reality it means on. For instance, let us say that Peter addressed them in the temple. Does this not simply mean that the act took place on the floor of the
temple, within its walls? This is the true sense of *in*, generally speaking.

2. Wherever *into* is found in the Scriptures, the sense must be determined by circumstances. Into the wilderness, into a mountain, into a tree. Here the reader must regulate his thoughts by the circumstances of the cases. But in reference to the use of into, in the baptism of the eunuch by Philip, we are to understand it thus, that whether both were at the edge of the water, or in the water up to their chins, Philip baptized the eunuch by affusion, if he followed up John’s mode, which was a baptism with water, not a baptism in water.

3. And wherever we find *with* connected with baptism, we are to view it in this light, that it simply denotes the manner in which the people were baptized, which was evidently by affusion, immersing in water being incompatible with every idea of baptizing *with water*, the very thing John did.

The reader can now perceive that we can allow the immersionist to carry the eunuch by the word *into* up to his chin in water, and then keep him from being baptized by immersion, the Scriptures declaring, wherever they speak of mode, that the act was *with* water, not in water. This is the decision of the Book, the court of Caesar to us all. With this decision before our eyes, we implicitly believe and record the pleasing fact, that Philip baptized the eunuch by affusion. All this we make plain from the English translation, by an English argument, taking it for granted that Philip and John baptized alike. (See Chapter X, where this matter is carefully examined.)
CHAPTER XX.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Having particularly noticed all the baptisms by John, and the baptism of the eunuch by Philip, we shall now proceed to examine the baptism spoken of in Romans vi, 4: "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death." Immersionists do greatly err here, when they assert that immersion is unequivocally spoken of in this passage. We say they do greatly err here; and now for the reasons for this belief.

1. The Christians at Rome had not been visited by any member of the apostolic college when the epistle from which the above passage is taken was written; and from this fact the presumption is, that they only knew whatever baptism the day of Pentecost revealed to them; for some of them were then there, and returned to Rome believers in Christ, which entitled them to the name of Christians, which they honorably maintained until the apostle informed them of being buried with Christ by baptism. Now, in view of this state of the case, which opens up before us a people without apostolic organization, do not immersionists venture too far when they dogmatically preach that these Romans were immersed? Who immersed them? Where were they immersed? The only answer that can be given here is, that they were baptized, at least the first fruits of them, on the day of Pentecost; and if any baptisms took place after this, they had to be performed by some of their own number. This is a fair aspect of the case, and this, we think, ought to cause men to speak with becoming modesty, under such circumstances, especially on the exact nature of the baptism mentioned by the apostle.
2. The Christians at Rome could not have been said to be in a state of water baptism when the apostle wrote, seeing that the apostle did not write to them for many years after the first of them had been baptized on the day of Pentecost; and this fact of itself is sufficient to startle us from water baptism, when we read, "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death," which evidently sets forth a state of their condition incompatible with a state of water baptism, which must have taken place previous to this declaration of the apostle, which embraced their state when he wrote, and not, in the abstract, their state when baptized with water, which was in the past, and not in the present. This we consider an insurmountable difficulty to all who consider the passage as including the idea of water baptism. Of a truth, these Christians could not have been under the influence of any mode of water baptism at the time the apostle wrote; for, as the language speaks of their state when it was written, one mode of baptism would be as much against its true sense as another.

3. When we view the time and place of the apostle's baptism, and the time and place of the baptism of the Roman Christians, we cannot for a moment think that the apostle intended to convey the idea that he and these Romans were in a state of baptism by water when he wrote, seeing he used a verb in the present tense, are buried, not were buried. This verb being in the indicative mood, present tense, passive voice, an act by water baptism, which had taken place long previous, would seem most positively excluded. This reason receives additional force from the fact, that the new translation of the Scriptures, which was a subject of great excitement before the Baptist Bible Society in New York, this year, has rendered the passage thus, "were buried." This embraces
the very idea for which we contend, that it would require a verb in the past tense to convey a proper idea of an act in past time, which the water baptism of the Romans and Paul was.

4. An immersionist, in view of these things, must first prove that at least some of these Romans were baptized on the day of Pentecost by immersion, before he can make any reasonable showing in his own favor; and could this be made appear, the mode of John's baptism would be abandoned, which was with water, not in water.

5. An immersionist must also prove here, that an act wholly past can be spoken of by a verb in the present tense, before he can receive the most remote sanction from the structure of the language, "Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death." To illustrate this—would an immersionist speak of his own baptism and the baptism of a whole church, by a verb in the present tense, on the supposition that his and their baptism had taken place a number of years previous to writing? He would not.

6. An immersionist is compelled, if he be consistent with the demands of language, to look on Paul and the Christians at Rome as being in a state of baptism by water at the very time the passage before us was written; and this opens up before us this fearful absurdity, that Paul was, with these Christians, in a state of water baptism from the hour he was baptized, in the city of Damascus, until he wrote, "We are buried with him by baptism into death;" for the language admits of no other construction, their condition being designated in the present, which is directly at war with a past act. Let the immersionist believe all that we here place before him, as properly belonging to his creed, if he can, while we proceed to give a meaning to the passage that we trust will be found
striking, impressive, and simple, a meaning foreign to any mode of baptism by water, purely spiritual. The argument of the apostle would seem to run thus: "How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?" That is, we who are quickened in the inner man by the Holy Ghost, are made alive unto God in the spirit of our minds, and dead to the world, its maxims, customs, and fashions. From this view of this case, he invites attention to a great truth, that those of them who were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death; meaning, that as Christ, into whom they were baptized by the spirit of his grace, was dead to the scenes of this life, so were they to the world, being placed in the likeness of his death to it, by the sin-killing power of the grace of God, which "reigned in them through righteousness unto eternal life." Now comes his conclusion from these premises: "Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."—This conclusion is both beautiful and full of meaning. The idea of the dead was previously presented, also the idea of a baptism into the death of Christ; and hence we find in the conclusion the idea of a burial by baptism into death, that just as a man when dead is buried, and when buried is hidden from mortal eye, so were they, Paul and these Christians, dead to the world by spiritual baptism, and their life hid with Christ in God—as hid with Christ in God, and as unperceived by sinful eyes, as a man covered in his grave. Moreover, the apostle increases the force of this figure by its junction with the death and resurrection of Christ in his conclusion. Hear how he works this matter into a beauteous form: "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." The meaning is, that as Christ rose from the dead by the power of the Father, even they, Paul and these Christians, should walk in newness of spiritual life, being raised into moral life by the power of the Holy Ghost. Hence we have a similar passage saying, "If ye be risen with Christ, seek those things that are above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God." This is evidently the full meaning of the apostle; and this view of the matter gives us to understand that Paul and these Christians were in a state of spiritual baptism when he wrote, being in this condition from the hour of their conversion till then, which justified the declaration, "Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death."

Now, if spiritual baptism occupied a dubious position in the Scriptures, we might doubt the above explanation; but as it comes up before us in positive terms, such as, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost—baptized by one Spirit," we cannot indulge a doubt on the point, but are compelled to give it as hearty a sanction by faith as the doctrine of baptism by water.

In conclusion, on this baptism, we would say, looking immersion right in the face here, that the Christians at Rome were baptized as John baptized his disciples—that is to say, with water, not in water. This aspect of the case gives us the Scriptures clearly supporting uniformity in the mode of baptism from the days of John up—yea, until the last apostle had baptized the last subject spoken of in the pages of inspiration.

Our conclusion on this whole matter is, that spiritual baptism is the entire burden of the apostle's arguments, and our reasons for this are before the reader; and, moreover, that Paul and the Christians at Rome were baptized with water—the
Scriptures deciding—and not in water, the doctrine of immersion. So the burial in baptism turns out, after all, a hidden life with Christ in God, being founded on the figure of a man hidden from the human vision when buried in the grave. *Dead, buried, risen* with Christ, are words full of meaning to every man who is baptized by the grace of God, and is walking in newness of life.

The next passage relied on to sustain immersion, is found in Colossians ii, 12: “Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.” Now, all the reasons given against immersion in the last few chapters, and in part of this, apply here. If the Colossians were baptized in water—the practical work of immersion—then they were not baptized as John practiced, which was by affusion, seeing he baptized with water. Every thing in connection with this passage shows that the apostle speaks of a spiritual work of grace in the Colossians; and the figures he employs to express this are highly significant and appropriate.

The last passage principally relied on to establish the idea of immersion is found in Ephesians iv, 5: “One Lord, one faith, one baptism.” This passage, strange as it may appear to some, is one of the plainest in the Book of God on this subject; and, so far is it from sustaining immersion exclusively, that it will be found in perfect conformity with the discipline of our church, which allows three modes of baptism. In order to make this plain, we must have recourse to illustration. B, C, and D, are tried for murder, and in winding up the testimony, it appears that B deliberately shot a fellow being, that C killed a servant with a stroke of a club, and that D killed his brother with a knife. Now, have we not three modes of murder here?
but will not the verdict be murder, irrespective of any particular mode? Certainly. So it is as it regards baptism. We have three modes; still, we have only one baptism. Modes of action are not to be confounded with the name of the act when completed. Three farmers may and do differ in their modes of farming, showing three different plans; still we call their work farming, irrespective of their modes. So it is precisely with baptism. We have three modes of baptizing; nevertheless, the work or thing, when perfected, ought to be denominated baptism. By thus keeping modes from being confounded with the thing itself, we understand the meaning of the phrase "one baptism." Who would dream of confounding modes of murder with the name? And who would think of confounding modes of farming with the term by which it is expressed? We pity men who cannot see a like difference between modes of baptism and the thing itself.

Let it be remembered, however, that, while we take this view of this passage, we are persuaded, if the Ephesians were baptized as John baptized his disciples, that they were baptized by affusion, John having baptized with water; and let it also be remembered, from the above comment, that we could bring up three modes of baptism before the face of the phrase, "one baptism," and receive its sanction.

After examining the various passages relied on by immersionists, we find affusion clearly established; and if the reader will please bear in mind that where the place of baptism is spoken of, in is used, and that where the mode of baptism is spoken of, with is always used, no doctrine of the Bible will be plainer than the doctrine of baptism by sprinkling or pouring.

We started with this idea when we took up
John's baptism, knowing that it was founded on John's own declaration, "I indeed baptize you with water," and end this chapter with it, thereby preserving uniformity in our views, such as the plain letter of the Scriptures justifies.

Now, if an immersionist take exception to these views and conclusions, will he just please to be so kind as to bring a reflecting, impartial man to the water, and a candidate for baptism, and show how he can immerse him with water, and get a verdict from this witness that he did so, and we shall abandon all here said against immersion.

We never met with such a contradiction between words and practice, as we find between immersing in water and baptizing with water. We can place a man in water or out of water, and baptize him with water; but no man can be put in water or out of water, and immersed with water. In short, the language of heaven and earth could not make a point plainer than affusion is made in the Scriptures. And here it is: "I indeed baptize you with water."

It will not do to place against the testimony of John, as applied in this chapter to the Christians at Rome, the views of Dr. A. and Dr. B. In matters of opinion they are entitled to some respect; but when it comes to a point that we are called on to hear the servant of God speak, mere opinions are out of the question. We repeat it, and would re-repeat it, that, if the Christians at Rome, when baptized, were baptized according to John's mode, they were all baptized with water. Gentle reader, this is the testimony of inspiration, not the opinion of men; and in confirmation of which, we shall here give the passages in which in and with are found. They demand honest attention. God speaks, and not man.

In. Matthew iii, 6: "And were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." Mark i, 4: "John
did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.” Mark i, 5: “And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins.” Mark i, 9: “And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of him in Jordan.” John i, 28: “These things were done in Bethabara, beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing.” John iii, 23: “And John was baptizing in Enon, near to Salem, because there was much water there.”

With. Matthew iii, 11: “I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.” Mark i, 8: “I indeed have baptized you with water: but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.” Luke iii, 16: “I indeed baptize you with water: but one mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes, I am not worthy to unloose: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.” John i, 26: “John answered them, saying, I baptize with water.” John i, 31: “Therefore I am come baptizing with water.” John i, 31: “But he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.” Acts i, 5: “For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.” Acts xxi, 16: “Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.” Acts xvii, 4: “Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance.”

In these quotations, we have the comment of the
Holy Spirit on the places of baptism, and the mode. In every instance, where mode is spoken of, the word with is used, but in every instance where the place is spoken of, the word in.

From the aspect of the case here, the matter runs thus,—in is used five times solely to point out place, but with seventeen times to express mode—nine times literally, and eight times in a spiritual sense.

When men think of baptism, let them call to mind the understanding of Peter on mode: "Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water," and they will never dream of immersion.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Our readers are apprised that we have examined all the principal passages relied on to prove the doctrine of immersion, and have found them clearly sustaining the reverse—the doctrine of affusion in baptism. This conclusion, in the form of proof, we were forced to, from the proper use, meaning, and application of English terms, apart from any appeal to the original. Chapters XVII, XVIII, XIX, and XX will be found living testimony, of the most satisfactory character, on this point. John baptized with water, not in water, and so did Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, and all who belonged to the apostolic college, if they baptized as John did. This we proved beyond doubt; and in view of which here we might stop—come to a full pause—only for the fact, that we are much disposed to confirm, by a number of examples, confirmation on this
matter. The first example we introduce may be found in Acts ii, 38: "Then Peter said unto them, repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Now, we remark here, with no ordinary emphasis, that there is not one instance recorded in the Acts of the Apostles where members of the Jewish Church, or proselytes of John's baptism, were baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.—The reason for making this remark here, is, the mode of baptism, as set forth or implied in this quotation, is not only misunderstood, but the nature of it. The reader will see from the plain teachings of the quotation, that Peter only required the people he addressed to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ. These terms do not include Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Had not Peter then an object of a most special character in view when he so addressed the multitude—departing from the formula as laid down by a risen Savior? He had. The truth is, he preached to members of the Jewish church—the greater portion, if not all, having been previously baptized by John. Starting with this idea firmly fixed in our minds, we can at once see why they were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and not in the name of the Trinity: for, as they had rejected and crucified the Savior, and stood in these particulars guilty, peculiarly guilty, but right in their faith on other points, the Holy Ghost saw fit to move the tongue of Peter to say unto them, that they should repent of these sins, and then be baptized in the name of him—the Lord Jesus Christ—the person rejected and crucified by them. A careful reader of the whole narrative will at once perceive that Peter only charged them with having taken the Son of man, and then with having crucified him; but in connection with this
he will also perceive, that the very moment Peter saw that they were convinced of these crimes he told them to repent of them, and no other, and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and that they should receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. But in order to illustrate what we are going to establish, is a backslider called on to repent of the sins he committed before he was first pardoned? We answer he is not, but of the sins committed afterwards. In like manner are we to look on those addressed by Peter. They were not called on to repent of the sins they had repented of at their baptism by John, but simply to repent of what they were charged with by the apostle. It would be well here to call to mind a well known principle of logic, that there ought not to be more in the conclusion than naturally belongs to the premises.—He that will have them repenting of more than Peter charged them with, of course, will have more in the conclusion than naturally belongs to the premises, and thereby show himself a false interpreter. Hear how the inquiring multitude talked to Peter: “Men and brethren, what shall we do?” Surely this will show that they were members of the Jewish church, and place them in the light we have considered them. Now, in view of occupying this position, the apostle was moved, as we have already said, by the power of inspiration, to have them baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and not in the name of the Trinity. Those who take the first passage quoted, and apply it to awakened sinners now, who can neither commit the crimes charged against the multitude by Peter, nor be placed as they were, do greatly err, and pitiable confound the peculiar workings of God’s preparatory plan of salvation. They were to receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. The gift of the Queen. Is the gift the Queen? Is the Queen the gift? No;
the gift is one thing, and the Queen another. In like manner we are to view the gift of the Holy Ghost as one thing, and the Holy Ghost quite another matter. The meaning of Peter is this,—that they should receive a miraculous gift at the hands of the Holy Ghost. The passage does not apply to the conversion of a sinner now, in any sense, shape, or form, and never did generally; and yet this is the very text relied on to sustain Campbellism.—What a pity Campbellites do not appear a little more consistent with this favorite passage! Why do they not baptize their candidates according to the exact form of speech used by Peter on the day of Pentecost, assuring them that they will receive the gift of the Holy Ghost in baptism, and let us see the result? Ah! this would not suit; for it would come in collision with the formula laid down by the Savior, which they practice at the expense of the form laid down on the day of Pentecost by Peter, and yet give no reason for so doing. We give the reason for Peter so commanding, as we humbly conceive, and have only here to add, that a similar form to the one laid down by Peter, was carried out whenever the disciples of John or members of the Jewish church were baptized, as any reader of the Acts of the Apostles can see; but when Gentiles were baptized, they were baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or in the name of the Lord, which was equal there-to. But the mode is the great point at issue, and not the peculiar character of this baptism. We then say at once, that the “three thousand souls” were baptized with water, and that this was affusion; for no man can be said to be baptized with water, and be immersed. Peter informs us on another occasion, “that he remembered the word of the Lord, how John did baptize with water;” and of course he remembered it on the day of Pentecost.
too, and intended nothing else when he required the convicted and penitent multitude to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ. Immersionists, however, will have it that they were baptized by immersion; and we are willing to give them a fair showing for their faith. Three thousand were baptized by immersion in one day, in a city. It will be a fair position, all things considered, to say that the work of baptizing did not commence before noon. Now, if we should admit that the remaining six hours of the day were solely employed in the work of baptism, and one of the twelve at work all the time, he would have had to baptize five hundred persons every hour. Again, if we should admit that the apostles divided the whole multitude into twelve equal parts, and that each one marched off at the head of his division in quest of water, and found it, would it not still appear impossible that three thousand could have been baptized by immersion in so short a time? The impossibility runs thus: we must here allow one hour in getting to the water, which will only leave each five working hours. Now, can we possibly believe that each apostle could have baptized two hundred and fifty in five hours? Surely, if they had all been standing ready to leap into the water, one after the other, at the bidding of the apostle, immersion would be out of the question, as it would have nearly given each apostle one to baptize for every minute of the whole time! To subscribe to immersion, is to subscribe to things of this class—things utterly impossible. Now, let us return to the scriptural declaration, that John baptized with water, and transfer this mode to the day of Pentecost, and all will be plain, and all difficulties at once will be removed. The immersionist insists, in order to be consistent, that John immersed in water, and that they were so baptized on the day
of Pentecost; but we insist, for the sake of truth, that John baptized with water, and that they were so baptized on the day of Pentecost, whether in the city of Jerusalem, in the brook Kedron, or in the pool of Siloam. We cannot too often give the language of John. Hear it, and think while you do hear, “I indeed baptize you with water; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.” We here persuade ourself, that the reader must be satisfied that it was impossible to immerse three thousand under such circumstances; and moreover, that if John’s mode of baptism was respected, they were all baptized by affusion.

The jailor’s baptism, Acts xvi, 19–39. Was it possible that this personage could have been baptized by immersion? It was not; seeing the act was in the night, and under circumstances that forbid the idea of going forth to seek water. Baptism was evidently performed in the principal room of the prison, and performed by affusion, unless we believe Paul departed from John’s mode, which was to baptize with water—not in water.

The baptism of the Gentiles, at the house of Cornelius, Acts x, 47. “Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?” Here we not only perceive that the Holy Ghost fell on them before baptism, but that Peter put forth the question, “Can any man forbid water?”—that is, forbid water to be brought. Now, if Peter had been thinking of immersion, would he not have said, “Can any man forbid us to go out to the water, and baptize these?” Of a truth they were baptized with water, when it was brought, and not in water, unless Peter departed from his own remembrance of John’s manner of baptizing, which was with water.

In confirmation of our conclusion on the mode
practiced on the day of Pentecost, we shall here add that it was the belief of the ancients that the three thousand were baptized by sprinkling or pouring. Zinchy deposes thus: "Three thousand were baptized no other way than by sprinkling of water, Lib. 2. Nicholson, Chamier, Lynwood and Bonoventura, and others, gave to the world the same belief. Pond says, p. 40, "On the whole, I cannot doubt that the three thousand were baptized the same day they believed, and that the ordinance was administered by pouring or sprinkling."

The reader may consider this branch of the subject dismissed. What we have said on one baptism would apply to all—namely, that John did not baptize in water, but with water.

BAPTISM OF SAUL, OF TARSUS.

We now invite particular attention to Paul's baptism. We reserved this for a separate consideration, being apprised that we could not do it justice without an appeal to an original word.—The account runs thus, Acts xxii: "Arise [anastas] and be baptized." We shall now quote a few passages in which the verb anastas is found, which will enable the reader to judge whether it is a verb that will admit of an action, such as running to and fro to find water to immerse. Matthew xxvi, 62: "And the high priest arose [anastas] and said unto him, answrest thou nothing?" In this case, did not the priest stand at once to his feet and speak? Mark xiv, 57: "And there arose [anastantes] certain, and bare false witness against him." Was not this a sudden act? Acts i, 15: "And in those days Peter stood up, [anastas.] in the midst of the disciples, and said." Did not Peter speak instantly on rising up? Acts xv, 7, "And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up [anastas] and
said unto them.” Was this not also accomplished at once, without delay. Acts xiii, 16, “Then Paul stood up, [anastas,] and beckoning with his hand, said.” Surely Paul spoke the moment he rose up. In like manner we are to understand the language of Ananias, “Arise [anastas] and be baptized.” — Now, the plain common acceptation is, that Paul arose, and was instantly baptized by affusion—being baptized in a private house. How immersionists can stretch anastas, so as to enable Ananias to go in quest of water to immerse Paul, is a point far beyond all ideas we have of honesty and propriety; but, that they do so, is too evident to admit of doubt. Just hear what a Baptist writer says on this subject: “See what a heavenly hurry Saul was in; though weakened down by a distressing fast, behold him, with great weakness of body, and load of his guilt, staggering along to the water! I almost fancy I see the dear little man—he was afterwards called Paul, which signifies little—hanging on the shoulders of Ananias, and hurrying him up, with his right arm around him; and as they walked on, saying, ‘Be of good cheer, brother Saul, when you are baptized, your sins, or the guilt of them, will be washed away.’”

Just think of it, Paul in a heavenly hurry to the water, though anastas required the act to be done at once. Every immersionist reminds us, when baptism is his theme, of Dr. Johnston’s well bred lawyer, who never was, and would not be, contented with the obvious meaning of any thing, when he could put another on it; but we beg leave to be unlike him, being content with the plain, obvious meaning of the Scriptures on baptism—that John baptized with water, not in water—which was followed up by all the apostles and their immediate successors.

Verily, if there is a place in the Book of God
where the mode, (mark this,) and not the point at which baptism occurred, is said to have taken place in water, we shall abandon our whole argument on this subject. Let this be produced if it can, and some change will be effected in the mind of the writer.

We shall here mention, by way of addition, the baptism spoken of in 1 Corinthians, xv, 29: “Else what shall they do who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all.” Tertullian, Theophilact, and Epiphanius, inform us that it was the custom of the Corinthians and Marcionites, if a Catecuman died before baptism, to baptize some one in his stead. Baptized (upcr) over the dead—over being a true signification of upcr. Could an immersion have taken place over the grave of a Catecuman?

We have no endorsement to fix to this, nor one word to say as it regards why the apostle did not correct the error, if his allusion were to this practice. We give the matter as we find it, and for what it is worth, knowing if they were baptized (upcr) over the dead, that they were not immersed.
CHAPTER XXII.
THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

As immersionists venture to say that all great men agree with them on the true meaning of the word baptism, and make thereby highly improper impressions on the minds of many, we shall, in this chapter, correct this misstatement, and place the opinions of some of the truly great men of the world in their proper light.

1. Zelemus says: "Baptism signifies dipping, and also sprinkling." 2. Astidius says: "The term baptism signifies both immersion and sprinkling." 3. Wickliff says: "It matters not whether persons are dipped once or three times, or whether water were poured on their heads." 4. Beza says: "They are rightly baptized who are baptized by sprinkling." 5. Whitaker says: "The word not only signifies to dip, but also to tinge or wet." 6. Mastricht says: "Baptism signifies washing, either by sprinkling or dipping." 7. Lightfoot says: "The application of water is the essence of baptism, but the application of it in this or that manner speaks but a circumstance." 8. Dr. Featly says: "Christ nowhere requireth dipping, but only baptizing, which word Hesychius, Stevanus, Scapula, and Budeus, these great masters of the Greek tongue, make good by very many instances out of the classic writers, importeth no more than ablation or washing." 9. Dominicius says: "In baptism there is something essential, as the washing; and something accidental, namely, the washing in this or the other manner." 10. Witsius says: "We are not to imagine that immersion is so necessary to baptism, that it cannot be duly performed by pouring water all over, or by aspersion." 11. Cal-
vin says: "Whether the person baptized be wholly immersed, and whether thrice or once, or whether water be only poured or sprinkled on us, is of no importance." 12. Dr. John Owen says: "Baptism is any kind of washing, whether by dipping or sprinkling." 13. Flavel says: "The word baptize signifies as well to wash as to plunge; a person may be truly baptized that is not plunged." 14. Glass says: "Immersion cannot be called baptism, any otherwise than as it is a mode of washing with water." 15. Ainsworth says: "To baptize is to wash any one in the sacred baptismal font, or to sprinkle on him the consecrating waters." 16. Wesley says: "With regard to the mode of baptizing I would only add, Christ nowhere, as far as I can find, requires dipping, but only baptizing, which word many most eminent for learning and piety have declared signifies to pour on or sprinkle as well as dip." 17. Dr. Adam Clarke says: "Can any man suppose that it was possible for John to dip all the inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judea, and of all the country round about Jordan? Were the people dipped or sprinkled? For it is certain that baptō and baptizo mean both. Those who are washed or sprinkled with water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I believe to be equally so with those dipped or immersed, and the repetition of such a baptism I believe to be profane." 18. Dr. Watts says: "The Greek word baptizo signifies to wash anything properly by water coming over it. Now, there are several ways of such washing, viz., sprinkling water on it in a small quantity, pouring water on it in a large quantity, or dipping it under water either in part or in whole; besides, pouring or sprinkling more naturally represents most of the spiritual blessings signified by baptism." 19. Dr. Doddridge says: "Our being cleansed from sin seems the thing principally in-
tended by baptism, which may be well represented by pouring on water; and as this more naturally represents the pouring out of the Spirit, the sprinkling us with it, the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus, it may answer as valuable a purpose as that mode which more expressly represents a death and resurrection.” 20. Watson says: “The word itself proves nothing; it signifies to be drowned by falling into water, to sink, to plunge up to the neck, to be immersed up to the middle, to wash by effusion of water, to pour water on the hands or any part of the body, to sprinkle. A word then of such large application affords as good proof for sprinkling or partial dipping, or washing with water, as for immersion in it.” 21. Burkett says: “In sacraments it is not the quantity of the elements, but the significance of them that ought to be attended to; as in the Lord’s supper it is not the quantity of the bread and wine taken down, so in baptism a few drops of water poured upon me, doth signify to me all the benefits of my Savior’s death and resurrection, as fully as if with Jonah I was plunged into the main ocean.” 22. St. Thomas Aquinas, evidently one of the most learned Romanists that ever graced the world with an opinion, says: “Baptism may be given not only by immersion, but also by affusion of water, or sprinkling with it.” 23. Dr. Owen says, speaking of the meaning of baptizo in the Scriptures: “In every place it either signifies to pour, or the expression is equivocal. I baptize you with water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, which is the accomplishment of that promise that the Holy Ghost should be poured on them. No one place can be given in the Scriptures, wherein baptizo doth necessarily signify either to dip or plunge. It denotes to wash only, and not to dip at all: for so it is expounded, Titus iii, 5. Wherefore, in this sense,
as the word is applied to the ordinance, the sense of dipping is utterly excluded.” 24. Dr. George Hill says: “Both sprinkling and immersion are implied in the term baptism.” Dr. John Dick says: “Examples, however, have been produced, from which it appears that the idea sometimes conveyed even by this verb [baptizo] is that of sprinkling, rather than of dipping.” 25. Dr. Thomas Scott says: “It [baptizo] is taken more largely for any kind of washing, rinsing, or cleansing, even when there is no dipping at all.” 26. Dr. Dwight says: “I have examined almost one hundred instances in the New Testament, in which the word baptism and its derivatives are used, and four in the Septuagint; and these, so far as I have observed, being all the instances contained in both. By this examination, it is to my apprehension evident, that the following things are true: that the primary meaning of these terms is cleansing—the effect, not the mode of washing; that the mode is usually referred to incidentally, wherever these words are mentioned; and that this is always the case whenever the ordinance of baptism is mentioned, and a reference made, at the same time, to the mode of administration; that these terms, although often capable of denoting any mode of washing, whether by affusion, sprinkling, or immersion, since cleansing was familiarly accomplished by the Jews in all these ways: yet, in many instances, cannot, without obvious impropriety, be made to signify immersion; and in others, cannot signify it at all.” 27. Pool says, speaking of baptism, as employed in relation to washing of hands before eating: “Sometimes washing only, or even sprinkling.” (Pond, p. 33.) 28. Coulon calls baptism "a sacred mystery of the entrance into Christianity, administered in the church, by immersion, washing, and sprinkling.” (Pond, p. 23.) 29. Vorrilong: "Baptizo in
Greek is the same as *lavo* is in Latin; baptism, properly speaking, signifies nothing except washing." (Enc. lib. 25, sec. 3.) 30. Bonaventura: "*Baptizo* in Greek signifies as much as *lavo* in Latin, that is, to wash." 31. Doederline: "The power of the word *baptizo* is expressed in washing, or performing ablution, on which account we read of the baptism of cups, Mark vii, 8; and the rite itself is called a purifying in John iii, 25." (Inst. vol. 2, p. 748.) 32. Attersol: "Dipping into the water is not necessary to the being of a sacrament. Sprinkling of water is not necessary to the being of a sacrament. But wetting and washing with water are necessary to the being of a sacrament." (Treatise of Sac. p. 108.) 33. Maldonat: "With the Greeks *baptizein* signifies to dip, to wash, to wash oft; and as Tertullian observes concerning baptism, (de Anima, cap. 10,) that it means not only to immerse, but also to pour, [*mergere non tantum sed et perfundere.*]" (Pond, p. 25.) 34. "Schleusner," says John P. Campbell, "whose fame is unrivaled and colossal in the literary world, thus expounds the word *baptizo* : 'Properly to steep and dye, to dip into water. In this sense, indeed, it is never used in the New Testament.'" (p. 15.) 35. Gases, a learned Greek, a member of the Greek Church, who, with great labor and pains, compiled a large (2 vols. quarto) and valuable lexicon of the ancient Greek language, which is deservedly held in very high estimation by all native Greeks, gives to *baptizo* this meaning: "To wet, moisten, bedew."

We have now before us a fair ample of the opinion of great men on the word, and from them the reader can see why three modes of baptism are allowed in the Discipline of the Methodist Church, though her ministers generally think affirmation is the only plain Scriptural mode; and why we state that immersionists make wrong impres-
sions on the public mind when they say all great men define baptism as they do, but yield to innovations, not believing immersion necessary. We leave the reader at this point, without comment, to judge whether the statements of these authors will justify the use immersionists make of them, confident that the decision will be, that sprinkling or affusion is fully vindicated by their judgments.

Historical facts on the mode of baptism will be found in place here, which we proceed to give.

1. In Pond's work, p. 46, we find that Walker, a writer of great caution and research, mentions a case of much force, namely, that a man some sixty years after the death of the apostles, was traveling in a desert, took sick, desired baptism, and was baptized by sand being thrice sprinkled on him. But as he recovered, his case was laid before a bishop, who decided that he was baptized, "if only water were poured on him." We shall remark on this fact, that here we have a highly presumptive proof that the very idea of sprinkling this person with sand was taken from the Apostolic mode of baptizing with water. If immersion had been practiced thus early, would it not be reasonable to suppose that the person sick would have been covered with something to represent a burial, and then have been raised up out of it to perfect the idea of a resurrection, which the raising out of the water is intended to convey; and not a sprinkling with sand, which illustrates affusion? We consider the idea found in this case an invincible one in favor of affusion, and almost divinely recorded against immersion. Here we ask, is there any plain idea of immersion so near the apostles as this? We answer, no. It is not on record.

2. Irenæus, 67 years after the apostolic age, mentions this fact: "that Christians baptized by affusion." (Lib. i, chap. 39.)
3. "Novatian became a Christian one hundred and twenty years after the apostles, and was baptized by affusion or sprinkling." (See Wall's Hist. of Inf. Bap., pp. 353, 357.)

4. "Robertson mentions the practice of sprinkling in Africa in the third century." (See his History of Baptism, p. 402.)

5. "Constantine the great, who died in the fourth century, say 337, being clothed with a white garment and laid on his bed, was baptized in a solemn manner by Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia." (See Dupin's History Ecc., vol. 2, p. 84.)

6. Gennadius, of the fifth century, says: "Baptism was administered in the Gallic Church in his time, indifferently, by sprinkling or otherwise." (See Watson's Institutes, p. 649.)

7. Dr. Wall says: "In the fifth century, baptism was administered in France indifferently by immersion and aspersion." (See his History of Baptism, p 357)

8. Pond says: "Pouring was anciently the established mode of administering baptism in the Netherlands." (See Pond on Inf. Bap., p. 48.)

9. "Estius, referring to times long before his day, witnesseth thus: that pouring had been much in use." (See Scrip. Ground of Infant Baptism, pp. 127, 128.)

10. In the middle of the third century, "When Laurentius was brought to the stake to suffer martyrdom, a soldier who was employed as one of his executioners, professed to be converted, and requested baptism from the hands of the martyr. For this purpose a pitcher of water was brought, and the soldier was baptized at the place of execution." (Wall, quoted by Dr. Miller.)

Query. If the martyr had been an immersionist, having the views of Baptists now, would he have baptized a man by affusion, when about to
die, to face the Judge of all the earth, knowing that nothing was baptism but dipping? Never. This example alone ought to be sufficient, as it is so near the apostles, to convince every immersionist that pouring was practiced in early times, and called a baptism.

11. Clemens Alexandrinus says, speaking of a backslider that was reclaimed by John before the glorious age of the apostles had passed away, “that he was baptized a second time with tears.” How strange this language, if immersion was only practiced in the early age of the church, or practiced at all! Baptized a second time with tears. The simple tears that ran down the face of the backslider resembled so much his first baptism by water, when baptized in the name of the Lord, that the circumstance presented the idea to Clemens Alexandrinus of a second baptism.

12. Gennadius, in 490, says: “The person to be baptized makes confession of his faith, and after that he is sprinkled with water, [vel entingitur.]” (Pond, p. 47.)

13. Clodoveus, king of France, in 499, “was baptized by Remigius, Archbishop of Rheims, by pouring of water.” (Pond, p. 47.)

14. Mabillon says: “Lindgerus baptized a little infant, by pouring on holy or consecrated water.”

15. Walafridus Strabo, in 850, says: “Many have been baptized by pouring water on them from above, and they may still be so baptized.” (Pond, p. 47.) But though this personage so spoke in the days of trine immersion, he is claimed as a Baptist.


17. Gratian calls sprinkling baptism, saying,
"The blessed waters, with which men are sprinkled, avail to their sanctification." (Dist. 4.)

18. The Agenda of Mentz, by Sebastian, says: "Then let the priest take the child in his left arm, and holding him over the font, let him with his right hand, three several times, take water out of the font, and pour it on the child's head, so that the water may wet its head and shoulders." (Wall, vol. 2, p. 395.) A note is appended to this, which runs thus: "That therefore there may not be one way for the sick, and another for the healthy; one for children, and another for bigger persons; it is better that the minister of this sacrament do keep the safest way, which is, to pour water thrice: unless the custom be to the contrary." (Wall, part 2, p. 395.)

19. In like manner the Synod of Langres mentions pouring in baptism thus: "Let the priest make three pourings or sprinklings of water on the infant's head." (Wall, p. 396.)

20. Robinson, a celebrated Baptist author, says, before the reformation, "sprinkling was held valid baptism in cases of necessity." (Page 116.)

21. The author of Letters to Archbishop Hoadly, another far-famed Baptist, says: "For thirteen hundred years successively, after the Apostles, sprinkling was permitted on extraordinary occasions." (Pond, p. 116.) These are great admissions for Baptists.

22. In Queen Mary's reign, the book of forms says: "The minister shall take water in his hand, and lay it on the child's forehead, and say, I baptize thee in the name of the Father, Son, and Spirit."

23. Aurelius Prudentius, who wrote 290 years after the apostles, represents John as "baptizing by pouring, [perfundit fluvio.]"

24. Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, about the same
time, says of John: "He washes away the sins of believers, by pouring of water."

25. Bernard says: "The creature [John] pours water upon the head of the Creator." (For these last three quotations, see Kendrick, p. 128.)

26. Erasmus says: "With us [the Dutch] they have water poured on them in baptism." (Wall, 2 vol., p. 392.)

27. Danaeus says: "At this day, they who are to be baptized are mostly sprinkled with water, and not dipped into it." (Cap. 29.)

28. The Synod of Aix says: "The pouring of the water (in baptism) be not done with the hand, but with a ladle or vessel kept in the font for that purpose." (Wall, 2 vol., p. 394.)

Now, in view of all the facts spread out before us in this chapter, we are prepared to pity every immersionist whose partiality for dipping leads him to assert that all great men agree in this, that to baptize properly is to immerse, and that nothing ought to be called baptism but immersion. Paul himself is criminated by the vow of the immersionist; for he calls washings and sprinklings divers baptisms. (See Hebrews ix, 10.) Luke and Mark share the same fate, for they call acts of washings baptisms. (Mark vii, 4, and Luke xi, 38.) Josephus, speaking of the meaning of the word here, says: "It seems to be used concerning washing of hands, which was done by sprinkling." But what of this? If Paul, Mark, and Luke are made out by the declarations of immersionists to be unskillful in the use of the word baptism, surely Josephus need not expect his knowledge to be honored! The Council of Carthage and the Council of Neocæsarea, may call "sprinkling or pouring valid baptism;" and so may Origen, and Cyprian, and others of the fathers, employ the word; still, an immersionist now
will not only disregard their judgments, but refuse to so use the term. Enough, however, of this, since the field it would open before us would demand more of the work of charity than of censure, under our present ideas and feelings.

As this ends our labor on the mode of baptism, we shall here insert our calm and deliberate conviction, in the language of Dr. Owen: "In every place it [baptizo] either signifies to pour, or the expression is equivocal. No one place can be given in the Scriptures, wherein baptizo doth necessarily signify either to dip or plunge. When applied to baptism, the sense of dipping is utterly excluded."

After a careful examination, this is our solemn persuasion. With John we shall repeat, when talking of the mode of baptism, "I indeed baptize you with water." This is our creed—our practice; and in the words of Taylor we would say, looking at immersionists, "Christian baptism, signifying life, they do not practice."
CHAPTER XXIII.

INFANT BAPTISM.

We shall meet this question without circumlocation, and on this account we here assert that infants are Scriptural subjects of baptism, there being no question as it regards the fitness of adults, all being agreed on this. We shall now proceed to bring up principles, facts, and teachings, that will most assuredly, and also perfectly, sustain and establish our position—that infants are proper Scriptural subjects for baptism. In bringing this matter fairly and strongly up, we must here present some rules by which the matter can be properly viewed, and a just decision arrived at.

1. It is a well known principle in law, which cannot be reasonably doubted, that when a right is once granted, named and specified, it (the right) must so remain until the law be repealed by the proper authority, and the record made.

2. When laws are repealed in part, a right sanctioned by the unrepealed portion of them not only continues as before, but receives an additional sanction by the act.

3. When a law is silently passed over that has been long in force, while other laws and portions of laws are repealed, this very silence is the strongest possible proof of its approval.

Now, let us judge by our first rule, and the result will be this—that as infants were once placed in the Jewish state of the church by divine appointment, and as the law that granted them a right to membership never was repealed, the right continues unimpaired, and ever must do so, until the Head of the church shall change the law, by abrogating this right, causing a record of the whole
matter to be made, so that all may read and understand. Were not infants placed in the Jewish state of the church by the authority of heaven? And were not the Savior and John the Baptist made members of this church, in which they lived and died, at eight days old? Was the law by which they had a right to membership when children protested against and changed in their day? This law, let all be assured, was not changed in their day, nor in the days of the apostles; and as it regards the Savior, John, and the other infants above named, they were introduced into the visible church under the abiding sanction of Abraham's God, Guide, and Instructor.

If the law of infant membership was repealed, let Anti-Pedobaptists say when, and by whom; and then point out the record of its repeal in the New Testament, and we shall instantly cease to be a Pedobaptist, and oppose the doctrine.

Is not this a fair proposition, though in the form of an argument? And is not our conclusion a just one—that a right to membership by law must remain so until the law be repealed, and a record of such a repeal be made? We insist on it, and know it cannot be contradicted, that God placed children in the church by a revealed command; and in view of which we do most positively demand, without equivocation, that our eyes be turned to the repeal of this law in the New Testament. Will the Anti-Pedobaptist please attend to this matter? Now, let us have a thus saith the Lord on the repeal. This is the very thing we want, and the thing he ought to give, or be silent. Ah, yes! he will! But how? By denying that infants were members in the Jewish state of the church, by circumcision, at eight days old. This is the most fashionable policy at present of the Anti-Pedobaptists; and is approved of by every follower of
Booth: still, this will not lessen, in the most remote manner, the force of a Bible fact—that God had a church in the wilderness, a portion of which was made up of children—children, too, that were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; nor alter the principle for which we now plead—that a right by law must remain until the right be abrogated by the repeal of the law. This is the grand point at issue; let our Pedobaptist friends but keep to this, and insist on having a thus saith the Lord, in such a chapter and verse, directly specifying the repeal of the law of infant membership, and Anti-Pedobaptists will not only be found unable to reply, but without any plausible showing on their side of the question. Should they, however, try to get out of this, by demanding a command in the New Testament for infant membership, tell them that this is asking for a law to prove a right, when a law is in force sustaining the right. How fearful is this absurdity! Had there been no previous right to infant membership; running before the days of the apostles, it certainly would devolve on us to produce a law bearing on infant membership, from the New Testament; but as the matter stands, it would be as foolish in us to look for such a law in the New Testament, as it would be for a lawyer to look for the incorporation of a city in the acts of a legislative assembly dated 1850, which had been incorporated in 1840. We do not look for the introduction of an after law to prove the existence of a previous one, but to the existence of the previous one to prove a perpetual right—for such it (infant membership) must remain, until the law can be proved repealed that originally placed infants in the Jewish state of the church. Of a truth, these considerations must address themselves to the thinking portion of mankind, and deeply convince them that God gave a law on in-
fiant membership to the household of Abraham, by which his seed, at eight days old, were introduced into the Jewish state of the church—not excepting the Savior and John the Baptist; and that this law is in force now—not having been repealed—addressing itself to every branch of the church that is properly instructed in the will of God, and duly organized according to the form of doctrine delivered to the world by the apostles.

The reader will now please return and read our first rule of judging, and take the principle therein contained as one of the strong reasons for the writer being a Pedobaptist, and why all should be so.

Having judged by our first rule, and found it invincible in its application to the doctrine of infant baptism, we shall now proceed to a similar consideration and use of the second—knowing that it will also clearly vindicate the same subject, and place it, if possible, in a stronger attitude, leaving it as if addressing itself, and commending itself, to the understanding of all. The meaning of the second rule runs thus: that when laws were repealed in part, or in part abolished, the law of infant membership remained untouched—was not changed nor altered by the prophets, the Savior, or the apostles—thereby giving us not only to understand that it was designed for continuance, but that it did, from this fact, receive additional confirmation. This principle, we think, must be embraced by every observing and reflecting mind. For instance, when a legislative assembly changes features of a law, and leaves other features of the same law unchanged, does it not, by such an act, give additional approval to the unrepealed portions of the law, while it leaves the rights allowed thereby, the same, or in as full force, as ever? Most assuredly. In like manner are we to look on infant membership. Many things were changed in the days of
the apostles, and many things numbered with the past, and accounted for as serving the purpose for which they were designed; but infant membership was allowed to remain as it was found by them, divinely sanctioned, and so to remain for all ages. It was not even mooted by one of them.

We admit, as clearly set forth above, that during the lives of the apostles, laws and customs that had been long time-honored, were either wholly abolished, or set forth to be continued in part; but insist that the law of infant membership was neither abrogated in principle, nor changed in any essential feature, but turned over to the church with additional approval; being accounted by the apostles, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, worthy of an abiding place in the book of life.

A question now of magnitude arises here: did the apostles repeal or change other laws, and leave the law of infant membership unpealed, thereby giving it additional confirmation? We answer, most decidedly, that they did blot out the lines of other laws, but left, at the same time, the law of infant membership untouched; thereby showing an additional approval of it, and placing it in the sun-light of Heaven’s greatest commendation. If this be doubted, let the chapter and verse be named in which a contrary doctrine is taught, and we shall abandon this view of the subject. Now, if this cannot be done—and we know it cannot—then our position in the second rule of judging stands invincible—that the law of infant membership was not abrogated by the apostles when other laws were, which left it under the influence of an additional sanction. This, we consider, cannot be gainsayed nor confuted by any of the sons of men, while justice, the nature of things, and sound reasoning, will remain respected by them.

The reader will now please return and re-read
our second rule of judging, and look on the principle it contains as our second reason for being a Pedobaptist, and why all should be so.

It remains for us here to consider our third rule of judging, which teaches thus: that the very silence of the apostles on the law of infant membership, when they spoke and acted freely in reference to the changing of other laws, is the strongest possible proof of its approval. To illustrate this, if an article of a constitution, when a convention meets to form a new constitution, be allowed to remain without discussion or objection, the very silence, of course, of the assembly, must be regarded as the most decided sanction of it. In this light exactly we are to look on the law of infant membership. This gives us a proper idea of its true situation. But lest we be misunderstood here, we remark, that while the apostles did not agitate the subject of infant membership, nor alter it in the most remote sense, but gave it their undisturbed, silent sanction, still they did directly and indirectly refer to it in their discourses and writings. To hunt for a law for it, however, in the New Testament, would be equal to seeking for a law in a civil code to prove a right while a previous law exists giving the very right in question. The silence, therefore, of the New Testament on this point, yes, its very silence, is the strongest possible proof of its sanction of it.

The reader will again please return and re-read our third rule of judging, and he will find, in a few words, our third reason for being a Pedobaptist, and why all should be so.

We shall now review what is before us on infant membership. If the existence of a church, with infant members, be denied, previous to the day of Pentecost, then our first rule, to such a person, and the argument thereon, will be found un-
meaning things; and the others, and the appended conclusions, alike so; but, if the existence of a church with infant members, previous to the day of Pentecost, cannot be denied; then our first rule, and the argument based on it, will be found infallibly correct; and the others, with the deductions therefrom, alike so.

To overthrow the preceding views, principles, and arguments, this course must be adopted—that is, direct proof must be presented against the right of infant membership in the church of God at any time; and this, of course, will place all we have said as unmeaning words, without any proper application to the question at issue: but, if this course should not be adopted, then its opposite must, that is, that infants were members of the church of God previous to the day of Pentecost, but that their right to membership was abolished by the writers of the New Testament; and this, of course, would destroy, if so, all we have said on the question before us, our remarks being without adaptation. Verily, if the former ground should be taken, then would the Jewish state of the church appear a compound of contradictions; and if the latter ground be taken, then it will devolve on the person taking it to show when the law of this membership was repealed, and the record of it in the New Testament: for unless this can be done, our position bids defiance to a successful contradiction—that a law once in force must remain so—forever so—until repealed. So much, by the way, for infant membership.
CHAPTER XXIV.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

We shall introduce one example more, illustrative of our position on infant membership in our last chapter. The State of Alabama has a law that provides for the protection of female property, so that it cannot be spent by the husband. This law, be it remembered, provides not only for the female child that now lives, but for every female child of the far off future. The child that is now sung to in the cradle has as good a right to the protection of this law as the young lady just lately married. So it is with regard to the right of infants to membership in the church of Christ. The child on the lap of the mother has a claim to membership as well founded as the adult who sings his hymn by the altar of the church. It will require a full repeal of the law in the State of Alabama, and a record of this made, before the child of futurity can be looked on as unprotected in the right to property that it (the law) now affords. The infant, in the days of the apostles, had a right to membership in the Jewish state of the church; and nothing could obliterate this right but a full repeal of the law that gave it, clearly expressed in record. These considerations are only an amplification of the leading principle advocated in the previous chapter, and are so intended.

Before taking up the scriptural authority for infant membership, which will be found in perfect agreement with what we have said on it, we shall introduce the custom of the Jews when receiving Gentiles into their communion, as it allowed children to be received, a circumstance that will shed some light on the subject under investigation, as now being handled.
Watson says: "This baptism of proselytes, as Lightfoot has fully showed, was a baptism of families, and comprehended their infant children, and the rite was a symbol of their being washed from the pollutions of idolatry."

In Calmet's Dictionary, article Proselyte, we are informed thus: "The Jews require three things in a complete proselyte: baptism, circumcision, and sacrifice; but for woman only baptism and sacrifice."

Maimonides says, who himself was a Jewish interpreter: "In all ages, when a heathen was willing to enter into the covenant of Israel, and take upon himself the yoke of the law, he must first be circumcised, and secondly baptized, and thirdly bring a sacrifice."

We introduce these last two witnesses for the sake of establishing proselyte baptism among the Jews, and not for the sake of directly establishing an included idea of infant baptism then; a thing that cannot reasonably be doubted, nor will not, except by him who denies proselyte baptism totally, a practice common with some Anti-Pedobaptists; because it evidently favors the baptism of infants now, from the fact that it then embraced them.

Dr. Wall says: "Whenever Gentiles were proselyted to the Jewish religion, they were initiated by circumcision, the offering of sacrifice, and baptism. They were all baptized; males and females, adults and infants. This was their constant practice from the time of Moses to that of our Savior, and from that period to the present day."

Dr. Clarke says: "The apostles knew well that the Jews not only circumcised the children of proselytes, but also baptized them. The children, and even infants, of proselytes, were baptized among the Jews. They were, in consequence, reputed clean, and partakers of the blessings of the covenant."
Dr. Lightfoot says: "They baptized young children, for the most part, with their parents." He gives us, however, this striking example on the baptism of an infant: "If an Israelite take a Gentile child, or find a Gentile infant, and baptize him in the name of a proselyte, behold he is a proselyte."

We think that the testimony before us, on proselyte baptism among the Jews, which embraced the baptism of infants, is quite sufficient to satisfy the demands of any reasonable mind; and, in consequence of this fact, we are not at all surprised when we find an Anti-Pedobaptist disposed to doubt the doctrine of proselyte baptism; but had it rejected infants, and only embraced adults—O! how he would have taken hold of it, as only being a shade less in force than this declaration: "Whosoever believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved." Circumstances, however, alter men's minds; and the fact of infants being included in the matter, and received with their parents, is a Mordecai before the eye of every Anti-Pedobaptist. But why try to hang truth? Infants were baptized as well as adults. This is the point we want to impress on the reader. Keep it in mind!

In this connection we shall mention—the belief of the disciples of Mesopotamia. It will give us a fine illustration of the subjects of John's baptism; and accord finely with the views before us, and the doctrine we are advocating. "These disciples not only call themselves the followers of John the Baptist, who was a follower of Christ, but have, their children baptized at thirty days old. They take the child to the bank of the river, where the priest sprinkles water on it; and when the celebrated Wolf asked them, after a visit to them, why they baptized in rivers, the answer was, 'Because St. John the Baptist baptized in the river Jordan.'" This is their faith, the above their action on it.
From the quotations now presented, we learn this pleasing truth—that infants were baptized in all ages by the Jews, and that John the Baptist baptized infants at the river Jordan, by sprinkling.

It is highly worthy of remark here, that the children that were received into the Jewish state of the church, by baptism and circumcision, whether we refer to proselytes, or their own natural offspring, were allowed to commune at twelve years old. Hear Bishop Patrick on this matter: “When children were twelve years old, their parents were bound to bring them to the temple at the Passover.” This will account for a statement in the New Testament, that Jesus was found disputing in the temple at this very age. Was not the Savior brought up to the temple to commune there, by virtue of his infant membership in the Jewish state of the church? Certainly. Thus have we infant membership in the Jewish state of the church manifestly proved in the case of the Savior, from the Scriptures, at twelve years old; this being the time he had to appear in public worship by virtue of his circumcision at eight days old, which made him a member of this church, and secured to him a right to fellowship and communion, exactly at the above age.

The reader will please consider the preceding facts and reflections as making our fourth reason for being a Pedobaptist, and vindicating the doctrine.

We shall now hear the Scriptures. Matt. xxi, 43: “Therefore say I unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.” We know that the Jewish state of the church is what is spoken of in this passage; and we know and proved that this church had infant members. The meaning is, that the kingdom of God, as constituted in its mem-
bers, should be set up among the Gentiles. We beg no question here, ask no implication. It had infant members in its Jewish attitude, and must have infant members in its Gentile attitude. Apart from this, the passage is made an unmeaning array of words, in our humble judgment.

The reader will please regard this text and these thoughts as forming our fifth reason for being a Pedobaptist, and advocating the doctrine.

Eph. ii, 14: "For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us." Jews and Gentiles are here included. The meaning is, that the thing which had long separated the Gentiles from the Jews had been broken down by the death of Christ, which afforded an opportunity to the Gentile of being one with the Jew in all things. The Jewish state of the church was not dissolved at the calling in of the Gentiles. Does the taking down of a partition set forth the idea of the ruin of an organized society? No; but simply a oneness of the families, under the control and guidance of the hand that removed the difficulty. The fact of the Gentiles being made one with the Jews, evidently gives us to know that their children had the same right to membership that the Jewish children always had, though the form of the initiatory ceremony stood somewhat changed. They were now one. The children of the one stood as the children of the other. The opposer of this doctrine must prove that the law that granted infant membership to the Jews, while the partition was standing, was repealed, totally abrogated, before the partition was pulled down, or believe what we have said on this text.

The reader will please to look on this text and these considerations as constituting our sixth reason for being a Pedobaptist, and pleading for the doctrine.
Romans xi. 17: "And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them, partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree; boast not thyself against the branches." We learn from this passage that the ancient church state was continued, having some of its members broken off, and the Gentiles grafted in. The very idea of the wild olive tree, including a variety of branches, great and small, is sufficient of itself to convince the thinking mind that infants were intended in the figure as well as adults. The branches that were broken off had their children broken off with them, and the branches that were grafted in with the wild olive tree had their children grafted in with them. The former, of course, refers to the unbelieving Jews, and the latter to the believing Gentiles.

The reader will please regard this text and these views as forming our seventh reason for being a Pedobaptist, and defending the doctrine.

Mark x, 14: "But when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God." The first passage quoted on this feature of the subject, shows that the kingdom of God, as viewed by the Savior, was neither more nor less than the Jewish state of the church. If this be the sense here, then we are to understand the Savior as directly inculcating the doctrine of infant membership in the Jewish state of the church; and this, when connected with his own declaration that this kingdom should be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof, almost amounts, if it does not amount, to the most positive assurance that infant members should be in the gospel state of the church, when beautifully incorporated with the permanent
good of the old. But if it has not the sense above named, but refers to the kingdom of heaven spoken of by John, then we are to understand the Savior as plainly teaching that infants make a portion of his church or kingdom in its Christian state; and as adults enter by baptism, the children must so enter, or cannot be said to belong to the kingdom of heaven or state of the Christian church. It will not do to try to avoid these consequences by saying that the text may refer to the kingdom of heaven above; for it has no such significance in the general teachings of the history of our Lord. It either refers to the Jewish state of the church, or to the Christian state of the church as constituted from the day of Pentecost up.

The reader will please to note down this passage and these reflections as amounting to our eighth reason for being a Pedobaptist, and strenuously maintaining the doctrine.

Acts ii, 39: "For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Now, let it be kept in mind, that this passage was addressed to a people who had known nothing contrary to church membership for their children, had always been used to it, and their fathers before them, as may be seen by referring to the first portion of this chapter, and we shall be compelled to come to the conclusion that Peter taught the doctrine of infant membership on the day of Pentecost, and that his hearers so understood him, and could not well understand him in any other light. They had always received the Gentiles into their state of the church by families, baptizing their children; and when Peter spoke to them on baptism, and of the promise being to them, and their children, they could have had no other idea than that of infant baptism. Peter had a fine opening here to abro-
gate infant membership; still he confirms it by preaching baptism to the people, and saying, the promise is to you, and to your children, and to them that are afar off, and to their children, and to as many as the Lord your God shall call, and to their children. This is the full sense of the passage, and we think we have already presented its true meaning.

The reader will please regard this passage, and the views thereon expressed; as amounting to our ninth reason for being a Pedobaptist, and tenaciously clinging to the doctrine.

1 Corinthians x, 2: "And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Now, the significance of this text, in connection with the narrative with which it is identified, would seem to run thus: that the breaking of Egypt's yoke from off the neck of the Israelites, was a type of our redemption from sin now; that their journey through the wilderness was a type of our journey now; that their baptism by affusion from the cloud, and by the sprinkling of the spray from the ocean, was a type of our baptism now; that the subjects of baptism then were types of the subjects of baptism now; the adult men then representing the adult men now; the adult women then representing the adult women now; and the children then representing the children now. To exclude one of these types, or representations, would be equal to making this text imperfect in meaning; but to retain these types, or representations, as just laid before us, is, we humbly think, equal to having, and keeping to, a proper view of the matter. Was not the child baptized as well as the adult? Certainly. If the adult was a type, was not the child a type also? Most assuredly. Here, then, we have infant baptism directly taught, for our faith and practice now, typically.
The reader will please to look on this passage, and the comments founded on it, and in connection with it, as making up our tenth reason for being a Pedobaptist, and earnestly pressing the doctrine on the belief of all.

Ephesians vi, 1: "Children, obey your parents in the Lord." Now, the first thing to settle here is, what is the Scriptural sense of being in the Lord? The Scriptures must answer. Romans xvi, 2: "That ye receive her in the Lord." In the eighth verse we read: "Greet Amplias, my beloved in the Lord." In the eleventh verse we read: "Greet them that be of the household of Narcissus, which are in the Lord." In the twelfth verse we read: "Salute the beloved Persis, which labored much in the Lord." And in the thirteenth verse we read: "Salute Rufus, chosen in the Lord."

To be in the Lord, from these passages, evidently means a condition in the church. If Rufus was chosen in the Lord, and in a church relation to him, so were the children at Ephesus, for they were said to be in the Lord. The sense, if taken thus, would be more striking: "Children in the Lord, obey your parents." This is the teaching of the passage. If this be doubted, let the reader turn to the fourth verse of Ephesians vi, and the reading will be found thus: "Bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." These are the same children.

If these passages, bearing on children, do not prove them to be in the church, the passages quoted above do not prove the persons mentioned in the church.

Immersionists, however, can find a way to fix the matter, that they were well grown children, because Paul addressed them. So would a Pedobaptist write, in a letter to a family loved, and mean the youngest child at the fireside.
But this cannot ward off the force of the passage. The question of interest is, when were the children of Ephesus baptized, and thus placed in the Lord, that is, in church relation to him? We answer, in infancy. No other reasonable answer can be given. They were placed in the church, doubtless, yea, it amounts to a certainty, when the church was established there.

Now, do we not furnish a passage as clearly showing children in the Christian state of the church, as that Rufus was in the church? Let him gainsay this that can.

This passage not only forms our eleventh reason for being a Pedobaptist, but deeply impresses us with the truth advocated by our hallowed creed, and inspires us with new zeal to recommend it to all, our foundation being surer than the everlasting hills, being based on the unchanged law of God.

In winding up this part of our argument, we observe, that we proved that infant membership was founded in the Jewish state of the church, under the sanction of God; that the children of Gentiles were baptized on entering into this state of the church; that the law on infant membership was carried out in the case of John and the Savior when eight days old; that it was not repealed in their day, nor during the lives of the apostles, which leaves it still in force; that the silence of the apostles on this law, when they spoke and wrote against the continuance of other laws, was the strongest possible proof that they could have given of its approval; that the Savior and the apostles referred to this right to membership in the texts quoted, which shed all necessary light on the subject, and make it palpably evident that infant membership is as clearly understood in the New Testament, as it is clearly taught in the Old, nothing more being needed.
The day-light of truth from Heaven's own book now dawns upon us. Let us walk in this light, guided by the old landmarks of the apostles and martyrs.

CHAPTER XXV.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

The principles, arguments, and passages from the Scriptures, as laid down in the last two chapters, we consider quite satisfactory on infant membership, yea, unanswerable: still we shall proceed to array some confirmatory proof in this, which will be found arresting, interesting, and irresistible, when viewed in connection with what is before us on this point, and as founded thereon.

Genesis xvii, 7: "I will establish my covenant—to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed." Acts ii, 39: "For the promise is unto you, and to your children." These promises, be it remembered, are connected with religious ordinances, the former to circumcision, and the latter to baptism; and in consequence of which infants are placed in the same relation now to baptism that they were anciently to circumcision. In the first text we recognize the right of infant membership, and in the second a continuance of it. Here we pause to ask, was there any repeal, after the day of Pentecost, of this right? We most confidently answer, no! Here, then, we perceive an infallible confirmation of what we said in our first rule of judging, Chapter XXIII., that a law once in force must so remain until repealed or abrogated.

Infant membership, in view of this aspect of the case, is as clearly taught in the passage from Acts as in the one from Genesis.
But the Anti-Pedobaptist meets us here with a Greek Lexicon open in his hand, and informs us that *tekna*, the word from which *children* is translated, means *posterity*; and then adds this much of his own, "adult posterity," which he follows up by gravely asserting that the true meaning of Peter runs thus: "For the promise is to you, and to your adult posterity." Surely a desperate cause requires a desperate argument, and here we have a glance at both. *Tekna*, as used by Peter, simply means infant posterity in a direct sense; for, when we speak of our *posterity*, do we not mean children or infants? Certainly. The word *tekna* comes from the verb *tikto*, which signifies to bring forth, and leads us at once to think of offspring. *Sperma*, the word from which *seed* is translated, in the passage from Genesis, is synonymous with *tekna*; hence *seed* and *children* mean the same thing.

*Tekna* and *sperma* must alike be abandoned by every Anti-Pedobaptist. They cannot even remotely assist his cause. Ours, of a truth, has their only support.

Have we not often been told, if the word *children* stood allied with the baptismal accounts of the New Testament, that there would never have been any opposition to their baptism? How sad a mistake! Have we not children spoken of in connection with the baptism of adults by Peter? Does this fact quiet the feelings of the Anti-Pedobaptist, in any sense or form? Nay, he roundly asserts again and again, that the term *children* means "adult posterity." Paul emphatically teaches us that children were in the church, being in the Lord. Does this appear plain enough for the demands of immersionists, or more strictly Anti-Pedobaptists? No. Ripley would inform us that the individuals spoken of by Paul, or by Peter, by the use of the term *children*, "might have been
either twenty days, twenty months, or twenty years old." (See his work, p. 230.) In view of this fact, what purpose would it have served, if the term children had been employed in every place where baptism is named? It would only have opened a field for the Anti-Pedobaptist to say, and to contend, that the uniform meaning of tekna, as used in the New Testament, "is neither more nor less than adult posterity." Again, are our readers apprised that the same position is taken where the term children occurs in the writings of the fathers? The moment the Anti-Pedobaptist approaches the word children in the works of the fathers, he begins to preach about "adult posterity." Then let Pedobaptists be persuaded of this fact, that if the apostles had introduced the term children at every point they baptized, and used it as Peter or Paul did, this would not have silenced the opposition to infant baptism. Our reasons for this belief are now before the reader, and we persuade our mind that he will perceive that the reasons as well as the belief are well founded.

The preceding reflections, texts, and terms, shed additional light on our subject, and broadly expose the weakness of its opposers.

The Anti-Pedobaptist, not content with his exposition of tekna, gives us to understand: "A person who has a right to a positive institute must be expressly mentioned as having that right; but infants are not so mentioned, therefore they have not this right." This looks very well on paper, but let us see how it will work. Is not the sacrament of the Lord's supper a positive institute? Is a woman expressly mentioned as having a right thereto? She is not. There is no such passage in the Scriptures. Now, the zeal of the Anti-Pedobaptist, in this instance, as in the preceding one, carries him too far; for in laboring to exclude infants from
baptism, he excludes woman from the Lord's table, there being no command for her to partake equal to his requirement. His inference, however, cannot exclude infants; inasmuch as we have proved that their right to membership was not taken from them by the writers of the New Testament; that they were left to enjoy it throughout all generations. But alas for woman! for she is certainly, by the quotation, excluded from the Lord's supper, not being expressly mentioned. If she is expressly mentioned, let the passage be produced. But we shall here repeat, that there is no such passage. Why then ask, consistency being respected, for a direct command in the New Testament for the baptism of infants, when no command of the kind can be given for female communion? This is a fearful quibble, ruinous to the very cause that opposes ours.

Now, let us follow out the legitimate result of the point here at issue: "A person who has a right to a positive institute must be expressly mentioned as having this right; but women are not so mentioned, therefore they have not this right."

Let this point be but pressed on the Anti-Pedo-baptist, and he will soon cease to ask for an express law on infant membership in the New Testament, when he cannot produce such a law in the case of female communion. It is understood, however, from clear intimations in the New Testament, that women have a right to communion; and it is as clearly understood from portions of the same book, if not much more clearly, that infants have a right to baptism. This is all we contend for, so far as the New Testament is concerned, inasmuch as we proved, in Chapter XXIV, that it would be out of place to look for a law on infant membership in the New Testament, that this was given in the Old, and never repealed. The inves-
igation of this feature of the case has tended greatly to add force to our expressed persuasions, and to incite in us fresh zeal to expose the unin- genius quibbles of Anti-Pedobaptists. Wonder if they should not next turn in to prove that it was an error of the church to allow of female communion? To be consistent they ought. They would have more reason on their side in the latter case, than in the former.

But let us proceed. No man can determine from the word circumcision all pertaining thereto. The circumstances narrated fix the true under- standing of the matter, though it embraced a posi- tive institute.

No man can determine from the word baptize all pertaining thereto, as it regards subjects, or other- wise. The circumstances, usages, laws, and ac- counts, recorded in the Scriptures, must fix the true understanding of the case, though it reveals a positive institute.

No man can determine from the Lord's supper all pertaining thereto, as it regards qualification and subjects. The plain details that are allied to it, and the circumstances that surround it, must fix the true understanding of the question, though it embodies a positive institute.

Is there an express law for keeping the first day of the week instead of the seventh? There is not; still we keep it.

Now, as we determine the true sense in all these instances, so we determine on infant membership. The manner is justly laid down in these chapters.

In this connection we shall mention a sentiment of inspiration for the sake of an illustration by it, a sentiment that runs thus: "He that will not work should not eat." This, of course, does not apply to infants, but to adults. Apply it to infants, and death will be the result. In like manner are
we to view this declaration: "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved, but he that believeth not, shall be damned." Surely this applies to adults, and not to infants. Apply it to infants, and they are damned; for they cannot believe, therefore must be damned.

How plain this text when properly and liberally viewed! We saw, in the course of our remarks on this subject, that when a Gentile father or mother believed in the God of Israel, and desired to enter into the Jewish state of the church, he or she, and all the children, were baptized. Faith was only a qualification to the adult, while the innocency of years was a qualification to every child. A Jew clearly understood this matter; and in a similar way we are to comprehend the above text, and its application to adults and children now. Just as a whole family went into the Jewish state of the church, faith qualifying the adults, and the innocency of years recommending children, so whole families went into the Christian state of the church, with the above text bearing on them. The passage must now appear as plain in its meaning, with the preceding facts and comments before us, and as perfectly in keeping with the idea of infant baptism as any other passage in the Scriptures.

Having said enough, as we conceive, on law, right, custom, and the Scriptures, to satisfy reason that infant baptism has for its basis divine authority, we shall now hear the history of the Christian state of the church on it.

Justin Martyr, who wrote about forty years after the apostolic age, says: "We have not received the carnal, but the spiritual circumcision by baptism, and it is enjoined to all persons to receive it in the same way." Again he says: "Several persons among us, of sixty and seventy years old, who were made disciples to Christ from their childhood,
do continue uncorrupt.” (See Dr. Wardlow on Infant Baptism, p. 106.)

Here we not only have proof of circumcision being regarded as giving place to baptism, but that Justin Martyr and others were made disciples by baptism in childhood. We shall here observe, by way of adding force to this testimony, that Justin lived only about ninety years after Matthew wrote his gospel.

Irenæus says: “Christ came to save all persons by himself; all I mean, who are baptized unto God; infants, and little ones, and children.” This personage wrote some sixty-seven years after the apostolic age. Dodwell thinks he must have been born before the death of John. How could infant baptism have imposed itself on the mind of this man, so circumstanced, if it had not been practiced by the apostles themselves? This testimony is as satisfactory, in some respects, as if John or Paul had given it to the world, above his own signature; for Irenæus was personally acquainted with Polycarp, who was a disciple of John, and heard him preach. (See Wall’s History of Infant Baptism, vol. 1, chap. 3.)

Origen says: “Infants by the usage of the church are baptized. The church had a tradition or command from the apostles to give baptism to infants.” This personage was born some eighty-five years after the apostolic age. He was the prince of the fathers. His testimony is fully vindicated in Wall’s Defense of Infant Baptism, pp. 372–383. The church had a command or tradition from the apostles to baptize infants. This is quite satisfactory, coming from such a source.

Fidus, an African bishop, applied to Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, to know whether the baptism of infants ought to take place before the eighth day after their birth. This question was duly con-
considered in an African Synod, held A. D. 254, and composed of sixty-six bishops. The result was: "It was unanimously decreed that it was not necessary to defer baptism to that day; and that the grace of God, or baptism, should be given to all, and especially to infants." This decision was sent in a letter from Cyprian to Fidus. Fidus, of course, looked on baptism in its application to infants as taking the place of circumcision, and so made the inquiry. The decision embraced the same thought, but regarded the time as being unimportant, that it might be administered on the day of the birth of the child. What a number of bishops so believing, so near the apostles!

Jerome says: "If infants are not baptized, the sin of omitting their baptism is laid to their parents' charge." This personage wrote about 256.

Ambrose says: "The baptism of infants was the practice of the apostles, and has been in the church until this time." This distinguished personage wrote some 274 years after the apostles.

Augustine says: "Infant baptism the whole church practices; it was not instituted by councils, but was ever in use. The whole church of Christ has constantly held that infants were baptized." Again he says: "I have never read or heard of any Christian, whether Catholic or sectarian who held otherwise." This great man wrote so near the age of the apostles as 280.

Pelagius says: "Men slander me, as if I denied the sacrament of baptism to infants. I never heard of any, not even the most impious heretic, who denied baptism to infants." This very man, on account of his peculiar faith, would have been glad if he could have found a flaw in the history of infant baptism, or any set of men that had opposed it. Against the interest of his own faith, however, he made the above honest declaration,
namely, "I never heard of any who denied baptism to infants." We are tempted to ask here, where were immersionists then, such as we have now, that they could not even be heard of? Truly there was not one of them!

Augustine tells us that the baptism of infants was not instituted by councils, that it was ever in use; and Pelagius informs us that he never heard of any that denied baptism to infants. This is almighty proof. Our pity to him who will wantonly reject it. The far famed Pelagius flourished some 300 years subsequent to the apostles.

At the commencement of the 5th century, the council of Meletas decreed thus: "The Catholic Church everywhere diffused, always understood and asserted, that this [infant baptism] was an apostolic practice." (See J. P. Campbell's Discourse on Baptism, p. 47.)

In Wall, vol. 2, chap. 10, p. 501, we find the following, which we deem highly worthy of a place here: "Lastly, as these evidences are for the first four hundred years, in which there appears one man, Tertullian, that advised the delay of infant baptism in some cases; and one Gregory that did, perhaps, practice such delay in the case of his children, but no society of men so thinking, or so practicing; nor no one man saying it was unlawful to baptize; so in the next seven hundred years, there is not so much as one man to be found that either spoke for or practiced any such delay. But all the contrary. And when, about the year 1130, one sect among the Albigenses declared against the baptizing of infants, as being incapable of salvation, the main body of that people rejected their opinion; and they of them that held that opinion quickly dwindled away and disappeared; there being no more heard of holding that tenet, till the rising of the German Anti-Pedobaptists, anno, 1522."
The learned Milner speaks thus: "We have never had such a custom as that of confining baptism to adults, nor the churches of God."

The classic Brown deposeth thus: "None can, without the most affronted imposition, allege that infant baptism was not commonly allowed in the primitive ages of Christianity."

The plain spoken Calvin says: "Whereas certain persons spread abroad among simple people that there passed a long series of years, after the resurrection of Christ, in which infant baptism was unknown, therein they do lie most abominably; for there is no writer so ancient that doth not certainly refer the beginning thereof to the age of the apostles." (See his Inst. Christ. Relig., book 4, chap. 16, sect. 8.)

Comment here, after all we have said, and the mass of testimony adduced, we think, would be equal to wholesale superfluity.

We find one person in 1100 years advising a delay of infant baptism, unless in case of sickness, tending to death; and one practicing on the thought in his own family. Just two that acted so in 1100 years. What a thought for Anti-Pedobaptists to look at!

But we shall press the question, was there a regular branch of any church or society of men on the face of the whole earth that opposed infant baptism for 1130 years? We emphatically say there was not. If there be an Anti-Pedobaptist within the range of our reaching that can prove there was, let him speak, giving us the history of its origin and life, and we shall acknowledge a debt for the information.
CHAPTER XXVI.
THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

This chapter will end our labor on infant baptism, and is intended, in view of the proof before us, as a wholesale overture. From our last we learn that there was not a branch of the church, during the long period of 1130 years that ever opposed infant baptism. This is the testimony of Dr. Wall, and to show its force and truthfulness, we shall quote from Wilson, of England, a learned man and a professed Baptist, who said, in an address to the people of his own denomination, "Dr. Wall's History of Infant Baptism, as to facts, appeared to him most accurately done, and might be depended on by Baptists themselves." (Mem. of his life, part 2, p. 461.) Then we have this indisputable fact before us, that no society of men ever opposed infant baptism for eleven centuries; and here we add, that the slight opposition then offered soon passed away, leaving the question as found in the early age of the church, and practiced on by the holy dead, until the rise of the Anabaptists in 1522. The opposition to infant baptism, strictly speaking, may be dated 1522, as the matter spoken of by Wall, under date 1130, was rather of a momentary character, and soon disappeared. This aspect of the case places Baptists in their true light, and shows that they are condemned by the history of the church for eleven hundred years, or, more strictly speaking, for fifteen hundred years.

A remark here, however, about Tertullian, will be in place. The reader will perceive, by turning to Wall's testimony in the previous chapter, that this personage is spoken of in connection with one Gregory, and both represented in some cases, as
practicing a delay on infant baptism. These constituted the only exceptions, if they can be called exceptions, that Wall could find during eleven hundred years. The fathers, however, from their language, evidently did not look on these two individuals as constituting opposers of infant baptism, inasmuch as they inform us that they never heard of a man who did oppose it. We want to be particular here, as Neander seems to have given Baptists a crumb of comfort by his illogical deduction from the position of Tertullian. We shall, however, let Tertullian speak for himself, and then we can see the error in Neander's deduction, and why the fathers did not regard either him or Gregory as an opposer of infant baptism; for what may be said of the former on this point, will more than clear the latter. This is the testimony of Tertullian: "But they whose duty it is to administer baptism, are to know that it must not be given rashly. Therefore, according to every one's condition, and disposition, and also their age, the delaying of baptism is more profitable, especially in the case of little children. For what need is there that the sponsors incur danger; for they may fail of their promise by death, or may be disappointed by a child's proving to be of a wicked disposition. Our Lord, indeed, says, 'forbid them not to come to me.'" (Wall, vol. 1, p. 93.) From this statement of Tertullian we can easily see why the fathers did not regard him as an opposer of infant baptism. He simply advised a delay. This was only an opinion expressed. But does he not clearly give us to know that infant baptism was practiced by the church, and that our Lord said, speaking of children, "forbid them not to come to me?" Verily, the testimony of Tertullian, on the subject of infant baptism, is not surpassed, in some particulars, by any of the fathers. This is our solemn
persuasion. If Baptists can find comfort by the side of Tertullian, they are welcome to it, and to Neander's childish deduction from his advice. But did he not advise a delay of baptism in some cases of adults? Wonder why Neander did not, and his Baptist admirers do not, contend that certain adults ought not to be baptized, because Tertullian would not have "opposed such a measure, so near the apostles," if it had apostolic sanction! The true position of Tertullian was, to advise a delay of baptism till just at death. Let it be well understood, however, that the adults, as well as the infants, in reference to whom he advised a delay, were to be baptized in case of death. That the reader may understand the character of the opposition to infant baptism when it first appeared, after eleven hundred years had passed away, we shall here insert the views of the opposing leader, (Peter Bruis,) who speaks thus: "Christ sending his disciples to preach, says, 'He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned.' From these words of our Savior it is plain, that none can be saved unless he believe and be baptized, that is, have both Christian faith and baptism; so that infants, though they be by you baptized, yet, since by reason of their age, they cannot believe, are not saved. It is therefore a vain and idle thing for you to wash persons with water at such a time, when you may indeed cleanse the skin from dirt in a human manner, but not purge their souls from sin." (Wall, as quoted by Hendrick, vol. 2, p. 257). This is the way that the first opposers, as a society, of infant baptism reasoned; and of a truth, their reasoning is much more consistent than the reasoning of Baptists now. If the passage above quoted refers to infants, or applies to them, Peter Bruis was right in his conclusions; and every Baptist is but a
sophist beside him. To illustrate the error into which Baptists run on the commission of our Lord, we shall quote from Isaiah i, 19: "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land."—Now, infants can neither be willing nor obedient, consequently, the Baptist theory being regarded, they cannot eat the good of the land, and must perish. "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved, but he that believeth not, shall be damned." Of a truth, infants cannot believe, therefore they must perish, the application of this text by Baptists being respected. How blind is he that will not see! Children eat the fruit of the land, though they can neither be willing nor obedient. In like manner infants partake of the blessing of holy baptism, though they cannot believe.—It is the visible seal of their relation to their God.

But before passing on from these considerations, we shall give the admission of Dr. Gill, a distinguished Baptist writer, when speaking on the subject of infant baptism, which runs thus, that he was "not able to find one instance of an opposer of infant baptism," from the eleventh to the fourteenth century.

Infant baptism, be it remembered, was not opposed by any society of men, Wall giving testimony, for 1130 years; and then only by men who did not believe in infant salvation. This is enough—perfectly satisfactory. Baptists are wrong, unless we can persuade ourselves that Heaven designed them to be the only discoverers of truth.

We shall now present the case of household baptism. "And that Lydia's children were baptized is most evident from the Old Peshito-Syriac version, which says, 'When she [Lydia] was baptized with her children, &c.'" "And the old Coptic version says the same." (Kurty, p. 99. See Hendrick on Baptism, p. 19.) Comment is needless here, and
we shall only say of all the households spoken of in the Scriptures, if they were without children, they must be regarded as the most remarkable list of households that ever were recorded or heard of. We pause here, however, to record our conviction, that there ought not to be so much stress laid on the thought, that there were children in the households, as on the fact, that if there were children, they were most assuredly baptized, this being the custom of the age. Hear Wall again on this point, speaking of the Jewish state of the church: "They were all baptized, males and females, adults and infants. This was their constant practice from the time of Moses to that of our Savior, and from that period to the present day." (Quoted from Pond, p. 113.)

This is only presented to show the custom of the Jewish state of the church in the days of the apostles; but as it regards our opinion on baptism as a seal, and its true relation, we shall substitute the views of the fathers in the council of Carthage.—The council of Carthage not only looked on infant baptism as sanctioned by the Scriptures, but that it took the place of circumcision.

The opinion of Lord Chancellor King, part 2, ch. iii, on the decision of the council of Carthage, is well worthy of a place in this connection: "Here then," says he, "is a synodical decree for the baptism of infants, as formal as can possibly be expected, which being the judgment of a synod, is more authentic and cogent than that of a private father, it being supposable that a private father might write his own particular judgment and opinion only; but the determination of a synod of sixty-six bishops denotes the common practice and usage of the whole church." We shall add one item more in proof of infant baptism, and in proof of it taking the place of circumcision. Dr. Grant, in his ac-
count of the Nestorians or lost tribes of the house of Israel, says: "On the eighth day the child may be baptized, as the Nestorians are of opinion that baptism comes in the place of circumcision." (Bib. Rep., Jan., 1842, p. 77.)

Having given, in the previous chapter, the testimony of the fathers on infant baptism, and in this their conviction that it represents circumcision, we shall now insert for the edification of the reader, the position of the Waldenses on this question.—Dwight was informed by Bert, a learned minister among them, who had about five hundred volumes in his library, that "the Waldenses had always baptized their infants, and had always done it by affusion." The Waldenses' catechism, which was written A. D. 1100, says, "Children are to be presented for baptism; and this should be done by those to whom they are most nearly related, such as parents, &c." (See Hendrick on Baptism, p. 65.) Baptists, however, claim the Waldenses. Would that they would go and do likewise, both as it represents subject and mode.

Let us now advance to another form of proof, which will not only be found imposing, but will bid defiance to the work of cavil. It is getting quite fashionable with some Anti-Pedobaptists to contend that the children spoken of by the apostles and the fathers, "might be twenty years old," and in consequence of which we shall present some facts which will settle this point, and show how the fathers understood the matter, and spoke thereon. Our facts or proofs will be in the form of ancient inscriptions, which were taken from the sepulchral homes of the holy dead, and now make a portion of the history of the church. "How instructive and affecting this one: "To Nina Florentina, a most sweet and innocent infant, made a faithful by her parent, placed with her in a country seclusion.—
She was born the first of the nones of March, before day-light, daughter of Zoilus the corrector; having completed eighteen months and twenty-two days, she was again made a Faithful, at the eighth hour of the night, at the last extremity of life; she lived afterwards but four hours; the rite having been performed according to custom, she died at Hybla, the first hour of the day, the seventh of the calends of October, on which decease her parents wept with each other every moment of the night; open lamentation for the Christian dead—being prohibited as treason. Her corpse, with its coffin, by the presbyters, was interred in the burying-place of the Christian Martyrs; the fourth of the nones of October."

We remark on this, that correctors are mentioned as early as 117, A. D., and that there cannot be any controversy about the age of the child here presented. She was a child, in our sense of the term, yea, a baptized child.

But let us proceed—

"Cyriacus, a Faithful, died, aged eight days less than three years."

Again: "Eustasia the mother, places this in commemoration of her son Polichronio, a Faithful, who lived three years."

Again: "Uricia Florentina, a Faithful, rests here in peace. She lived five years, eight months, and eight days."

And again: "The sepulchre of the twin brothers Alcinous, and of Alexander their cousin, three Faithfuls, of twelve years old, erected by their mother Prœmissa. With three fishes."

On this last, we remark, that Tertullian sheds much light on the term "fishes," by saying, "We little fishes, according to the example of our fish, [ICHTHION] Jesus Christ, are born in water." Again he says: "One kind of flesh of birds, martyrs who
soared to heaven in sufferings; another kind of fishes, those who received only baptism.”

Let us, however, advance with the testimony of inscriptions. How striking is this one: “Here lies Maria, daughter of John, who was of the town of Nicerata; she lived three years, three months and a half, a Faithful. She died the fourth day of the month Xanticus, under the consulate of the Princes Honorius XI, and Constantius II.”

Here we pause to invite undivided attention to the following memorials: “Rufillo, newly-baptized, who lived two years and forty days. Quintillian the father, places this to the memory of his son who sleeps in the peace of Christ.”

“To Domitius, an innocent, newly-baptized, who lived three years and thirty days.”

“Valerius Decentius the father, places this to his son, newly-baptized, who lived three years, ten months, and fifteen days.”

“To Pisentus, an innocent soul, who lived one year, eight months, and thirteen days, newly-baptized, buried on the ides of September in peace.”

“To Jovicus, son of Callistus, who lived six years, ten months, and nineteen days, newly-baptized.—He died in peace.”

“To Leoni, newly-baptized, who lived six years, eight-months, and eleven days. He reposed the sixth of the nones of July, Phillippus and Sallia being consuls.”

“To Aristus, who lived eight months, newly-baptized. He went off the first of the nones of June, Timasius and Promotorus being consuls.”

“To the memory of Liberà, who rests in peace. She lived eight years, newly-baptized. She was buried the third of the nones of May, Gratianus and Equitius being consuls.”

In the language of Taylor, from whose work the above inscriptions are taken, we would say, “Hun-
dreds of thousands of Christian children died in infancy, whose graves were not marked by a single memorial, and of those which were so marked, not one in a thousand has come down to us.” We have enough, however, to give us to understand that the fathers practiced infant baptism, and were fully satisfied that the Scriptures justified their conduct in this particular, which is, and ever was, a subject of vital interest to the church.

Now, in view of the use of the word faithful by the fathers, let us quote from Ephesians, i, 1, and see how matters appear: “To the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus.” Paul here evidently draws a line of distinction between the saints and the faithful—placing the saints first. If we apply the sense attached to the term faithful by the fathers to this quotation from Paul, then it follows that the faithful spoken of by him were children in the church at Ephesus, who are expressly noted down and mentioned in the sixth chapter of this Epistle. The reader will please form his own opinion from the facts before him—facts that clearly show that baptized children were called faithful by the fathers. As it regards a quibble that may be made on the use of the term children by John, we have not a word to say; inasmuch as the man who cannot see that children, in the proper sense of the term, are clearly set forth by Paul in the sixth chapter, would not be convinced of his error, though one might speak to him from the dead. In the Lord, taken as a phrase, we have seen, by turning to the sixteenth chapter of Romans, signifies a person in church relationship to God, without laying any stress on the word faithful, as used by the fathers to express the same idea. Our conclusion here is, from the immediate considerations, that whether Paul and the fathers intended to express the same thought by
employing the word \textit{faithful}, one thing is certain, \textit{in the Lord}, clearly expresses church-membership. We would ask, in view of all these considerations, why did the apostles draw a line of distinction between the saints and the faithful, if both were the same? The fact of drawing the line, shows they were not the same; still we would not venture to say, speaking with certainty, that the term \textit{faithful}, as used by the fathers, ought to be exactly looked on in the light as the same word by the apostle.

We find a form of speech somewhat similar to the one just considered, used by the Savior, when addressing Peter: "Feed my sheep." "Feed my lambs." With regard to age, the lambs are placed in contradistinction to the sheep, from which we infer, the whole teachings of the metaphor bearing on our mind, that children were intended by the word \textit{lambs}. The relation of the sheep to the lambs has only to be consulted to make this plain. The idea cannot be properly applied to young converts. Sheep and lambs convey the idea at once of parents and children. This is our solemn conviction. Then let us say here that the lambs must be marked with the seal of baptism as well as the sheep of the fold. The lambs are as precious in the sight of the Shepherd of our souls as the sheep; and to this end Peter was instructed, when the Savior said, "Feed my sheep." "Feed my lambs."

Now, in view of all the facts presented in these chapters on infant baptism, we would ask, are Baptists wiser than the fathers were, who declared that infant baptism was ever in use, and received as sanctioned by the apostles? Are Baptists wiser than the true church of God, in all her branches, whose testimony is, and ever has been, that infants are proper subjects for holy baptism? Did the Christian churches in the East, or in the West, or in
the North, or in the South, ever refuse baptism to infants? Never. Then we ask again, are Baptists wiser than all the world? Is it possible that all are deceived on this point, and Baptists right? Let him believe with the Baptist that can.

But, in the face of all the facts presented on infant baptism, let us hear Dr. Howell, a Baptist writer, on the subject: "The sprinkling of an infant by mistake, and the refusal to be baptized, commonly its consequence—acts which, in the apostles' days, would have damned the perpetrator—are now innocent and familiar things." &c. (See Howell on Com., p. 94.) We have often used the word presumption, and heard it used properly; but if there be a case, above all others, where it can be applied with unequalled force and propriety, that case is now before us in the position of Howell, which is but the position, in strong terms, of every Baptist. How this pitiable weakness, set forth in unwarrantable and presumptive language, stands rebuked before the accumulated wisdom and learning of all ages!

In the name of Israel's God, with our mind firmly fixed on all the evidence produced to confirm the origin and perpetuity of infant baptism, we exhort our brethren to hold on to the form of doctrine practiced by the primitive church, and not, for one moment, to falter in either faith or practice. For this, holy martyrs lived, pleaded, suffered and bled. Verily, it stands out heaven-honored, time-sanctioned; was the glory of the Jewish state of the church, and is now the glory of the gospel state of the church. It was clung to with god-like devotion by pious mothers, and cherished as a loved thing, in the land where Ambrose sang, and Augustine saw lively visions of the city of God. It was baptized a thousand times with prayers and tears by those who gave it as a heavenly legacy to our
fathers and mothers, who sleep with the quiet dead. It was recorded and defended in ages past by those whose very names and ashes are immortal. Here we make our plea for those who cannot plead for themselves, nor ask us why they are excluded from the church without a direct command from God, who originated the relation. Could they claim their rights, we might be silent; but they cannot, therefore we plead for the lambs of the flock, and beg of parents to do their duty toward them, by having them baptized, and brought up in the fear of the Lord. Holy baptism, truth would utter, now and ever for infants. May the benedictions of the Father, Son, and Spirit, rest on the advocates of this God-honored truth, both now and ever, even so. Amen.

CHAPTER XXVII.

THE TRUE POSITION OF IMMERSION.

We shall begin this chapter by examining what proof there is on the mode of baptism within the limits of the first two hundred years after the birth of Christ. Josephus says, speaking of John the Baptist, in the discharge of his mission before God: "He commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, and so to come to baptism; for that the washing with water would be acceptable to him." (Vol. 1, p. 50.) The followers of John the Baptist, who live in Mesopotamia, and are mentioned by the far-famed missionary, Wolf, (vol. 2, p. 311,) baptize by affusion. "The priests or bishops baptize children at thirty days old." As they looked on themselves as following up John's manner of baptizing, Wolf asked them why they baptized in rivers, seeing
they only stood on the bank; to which they replied, "Because St. John the Baptist baptized or sprinkled in the river Jordan." Clemens Alexandrinus, speaking of the young man who fell from his profession of religion, after being baptized by the apostle John, says, "He was baptized a second time with tears." (Eusb., lib. 3, cap. 23.) In the time of Marcus Aurelius, 60 years after the apostles, a Jew is mentioned as falling sick and desiring baptism. Water not being at hand, "they sprinkled him thrice with the sand, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." Now, when he recovered, and his case was presented to the bishop, the bishop decided that he would have been baptized if water had been "poured on him." (See Pond, p. 45.) "Justin Martyr, describing baptism, A. D. 140, says, 'For they are washed with water in the name of God the Father, and Lord of all things, and of our Savior Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit.'" "The same Justin also says that sprinkling with holy water 'was invented by Dæmons, in imitation of the true baptism, signified by the prophets, that their votaries, those of the Dæmons, might also have their pretended purifications by water.'" Taylor well remarks on this: "If the heathen sprinklings imitated the true baptism, then the true baptism included sprinkling; for if there was not sprinkling, there could not be any imitation." (Taylor on Baptism, p. 143.) "Irenæus mentions a sect of Christians who baptized 'by an affusion of water mixed with oil.'" (Pond, p. 47.)

Now, from the facts before us we learn, in the first place, Josephus testifying, that John baptized with water; and in the second place, the followers of John testifying, that he baptized by sprinkling; and in the third place, Clemens Alexandrinus being heard, that the tears on the face of a backslider resembled his baptism with water; and in the fourth
place, the bishop and the parties concerned in the case of the Jew being allowed to judge, that pouring on water, or the sprinkling of water, was a baptism; and in the fifth place, Justin Martyr deciding, that a baptism in his day was a washing with water; that the true baptism signified by the prophets, which was that of sprinkling, was imitated; and in the sixth place, Irenæus being allowed to speak, that affusion was baptism, and was practiced by primitive Christians. All these testimonies on mode embrace the first two centuries, and most clearly express the doctrine of affusion in baptism. This, we think, is made so clear and is so prominently established, that he who will resist it would resist truth.

But what of immersion during the first two centuries? We answer, that there is not the first instance on record. The word baptize was not then so used by any of the fathers. And this is the position in which church history and the writings of the fathers place immersion. We repeat that there is not the first instance on record of immersion for two hundred years after the birth of Christ. "I admit," said Mr. Fanning, in his debate with me in Lebanon, "that there is not a case of immersion spoken of for the first two hundred years of the Christian era." Now, let immersionists produce the same amount of testimony bearing on immersion, within the first two centuries, and we shall admit they have a showing; but until they do this, we shall insist on it, that the testimony of the first two centuries is entirely with us on affusion, and entirely against them on immersion.

The reader will please keep in mind, that our testimony stands within the limits of the first two centuries, excepting that portion of it from the followers of John, which only leads there by faith and practice; and moreover, that we shall receive
any similar testimony from immersionists, if taken from the fathers, within the limits of the above time, or from a people claiming to be followers of John, and practicing immersion, in any portion of the world; promising to be convinced in proportion to the facts presented. But why talk so? They cannot present even one solitary circumstance where the term baptize was employed to express an act of immersion within the limits of the first two centuries. How withering this thought to the advocates of immersion!

Now, let us hear corroborating testimony in favor of affusion within the first two centuries, and see if immersionists can meet us on this point. Aurelius Prudentius, in 390, thus sung: "Worshiper of God, remember that thou didst go under the holy dews of baptism." (Pond, p. 46.) Paulinus, bishop of Nola, about the same time, said of John, "He washes away the sins of believers by the pouring of water." Bernard said, "John baptized the Lord after this manner: the creature pours water on the head of the Creator." Lactantius said, "Christ received baptism, that he might save the Gentiles by baptism, i. e. by the distilling of the purifying dew." (Lib. 4, cap. 15.) We have several engravings or cuts representing John as pouring water on him, all of which are ancient, were in existence before the now contending churches had a name; and on this account their testimony ought to be of great force. (See cut No. 1, as a specimen of the whole.) Now, can immersionists produce ancient engravings or cuts showing that John baptized the Savior by immersion? Can immersionists present such corroborating evidence, on the whole, in favor of immersion within the limits of the first two centuries? They cannot. All of this mass of testimony, be it remembered, exactly coincides with John's short sermon
on the mode of baptism: "I indeed baptize you with water; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost."

Having driven immersionists out of the first two centuries, not only by matter of fact testimony, but corroborating testimony, we shall proceed to show their recorded starting point. Hinton, a Baptist writer, places Tertullian at 200. Well, let us hear Tertullian, the first who spoke of immersion: "We are three times," says he, "plunged into the water, and when we are taken up, we taste a mixture of milk, &c.; when we go to meat, when we lie down, or sit down, and whatever business we have, we make on our foreheads the sign of the cross. If you search in the Scriptures for any command for these, and such like usages, you shall find none. Tradition will be urged to you as the ground of them, custom as the confirmor of them, and our religion teaches us to observe them."—(Chapter 1–3, C. M. Wall 2, p. 420.) This is Tertullian's account of immersion, and this, childish as it looks, is the first item of information that we have on immersion. He did well in saying, "If you search in the Scriptures for any command for these, and such like usages, you shall find none." If Baptists, who have one stolen dip out of Tertullian's three, as handed down on the ages, were to go to the Scriptures, they would soon find, apart from bias, that abused tradition is their only authority. Let us now hear Jerome on this point: "For many other things, which by tradition are observed in the church, have got authority as if they were written laws; as in the font of baptism to plunge the head thrice under water— ter capita mergitare." (Lib. 2, Wall, vol. 2, p. 421.) The head is plunged three times into the font. This is how immersion worked in the morning of its being. Wonder why Baptists did not light on this plan,
and reduce it into practice? Surely it would be much more in accordance with the refinement of religion, than one total immersion taken from a group of errors, fostered by tradition, without any pretence to Scriptural authority.

We shall now hear the testimony of Bishop Sparrow on this point, having heard enough from Tertullian and Jerome for present purposes, enough to show the workings of trine immersion, the single immersion of the Baptists not then being fashionable. "The old fashion," says he, "was to dip or sprinkle the person thrice, to signify the mystery of the Trinity. The church so appointed then, because of some heretics that denied the Trinity; upon the same ground afterwards it was appointed to do it; but once, signifying the unity of substance in the Trinity, lest we should seem to agree with the heretics that did it thrice." (See Family Prayer Book by Bishop Brownell, p. 415.) This will do to place by the side of Tertullian's view, and Jerome's idea. All, all was the work of men. The bishop, however, states that sprinkling was also an old fashion in baptism; and by the way, Tertullian was not so hide-bound on this point as Baptists, though he had three dips instead of their one; for he informs us, "That it [baptism] means not only to immerse, but also to pour." (See Hendrick on Baptism, p. 183.)

The reader, from these facts, can see why Calvin said that the church from the beginning had rites a little dissimilar. Perhaps there is not a writer living or dead, that has been so much misrepresented and abused on this point, as Calvin. Baptists assert that "he claimed for the church a right to change the ordinance of baptism." He never claimed any such right, and the man who says he did, ought to repent for so sinning against the memory and ashes of a great and good man. If our
memory serves us, Calvin said, "Better perish by the sword than touch the substance as delivered to us by the Savior." This is the idea, if not his words. We make these remarks to show that Calvin spoke the truth in what he said on the church and her connection with ceremonies in baptism; and also to show how fearfully he is misrepresented by Baptist speakers and writers.—Please read again Tertullian's view of this question, Jerome's idea, and Bishop Sparrow's declaration, and you will at once subscribe to the truthfulness of Calvin's statement. Enough, however, on this point.

The reader will please bear in mind that the candidates for baptism were plunged three times in water, when the doctrine of immersion was first recorded; and that this was not within the limits of the first two centuries, which leaves us to reiterate what we said in our third chapter, that the whole affair was an invention of the fathers, or a tradition without any appeal to the Scriptures to support it, Tertullian, the first man that ever recorded immersion, being the judge.

Trine immersion, be it remembered, and not a single immersion, was the general custom of the church, where affusion was not practiced, down till 1522, and is now carried out by some.

Hendrick says, speaking on the ground covered by this chapter: "Then, we conclude immersion was not known nor practiced for two hundred years after Christ. None of the apostolic fathers mention it—Tertullian first speaks of trine immersion in the third century." This is the true aspect of the case, clearly proved so in this chapter.

Hendrick says: "But it [immersion] never was considered essential to baptism by any writer, or sect, or church, till after Luther's time, when Munzer and Storch made it so in 1522." (See his work,
This certainly was the general custom of the church for 1322 years after the invention of trine immersion. Keep in mind this, inasmuch as a single immersion is rather a novelty, the history of the church being carefully consulted, for 1322 years after Tertullian. The Eunomians, it is true, had a peculiar way of partially dipping once; and as we are out on the history of dipping, we shall present a case, which runs thus: "The Eunomians had the oddest way of baptizing that ever was heard of, &c.; so they used to uncover the person to the waist, and then holding his heels up, and his head downward, they dipped him in the font as far as the waist. They continued this custom till a ridiculous accident happened; a heavy, unwieldy man coming to be baptized, they that were to hold him with his head down let him fall, and he broke his head against the bottom of the font. To prevent which mischance for the future, they invented another way." (Wall, vol. 2, p. 422.)—And this is how the history of immersion runs! But with regard to a single dip, whether in whole or in part, did not the fiftieth of the ancient canons order that "any bishop or presbyter that does not use the trine immersion be deposed"? Hence we see the church censured the single immersion, such as Baptists hold on to now. Affusion we found in the first two centuries, and immersion excluded; and now, by the decision of the church, when practicing trine immersion, we find the Baptist theory on one dip censured, and the minister that would practice it to be deposed. We have not to find, but now find, Baptists alone, and all the world against their theory, which has neither the Scriptures nor tradition to uphold it.

From what is now before us, we learn that trine immersion was generally practiced from the beginning of the third century till the fifteenth, where
affusion was not, such measures as the Eunomians being excepted; yet Baptists will tell the people that they have immersion as it came down from John. Our pity will be extended to cover up such duplicity, if accepted. John did not immerse, he baptized with water.

But, before closing our remarks on the rise and history of immersion, we shall state, that "the primitive Christians baptized naked." This is another feature in immersion of a disagreeable nature—trine immersion we should say, as immersion as now practiced, in connection with other things, was not known for fifteen hundred years after the birth of Christ. Wall, in speaking of the nakedness of the candidate for baptism, says, vol. 2: "It was the most usual and ordinary way by which the ancient Christians did receive their baptism." And did not the Anabaptists, the parents of the present family of Baptists, baptize naked too? Now we have leads, clothing on, things unknown to the origin of immersion: still, Baptists assert that the primitive church baptized as they do.—They did not. Verily, this is a slander on the origin and history of trine immersion. If the truth should be told by them, 1522 would give them their true starting point. But all this makes a portion of the workings of immersion.

Now, in view of the position of immersion by the facts presented in this chapter, do we not daily witness an indescribable affrontery in every Baptist, when he calls on us to follow the custom of the church in the third century, a thing that he does not himself, in any one particular. Did they immerse once then? They did not. Did they immerse then with their clothing on? They did not. We reject the whole, leaving the matter where the first man who mentioned it did, to the honor of tradition. We reject the whole with all our heart,
and enthrone in our affections John’s mode of baptizing, which addresses itself to all, “I indeed baptize with water.”

And here, in this chapter, we have the position of immersion, and of trine immersion, nakedness, and all. He that will advocate it, may claim the violated support of tradition; but to Scriptural baptism, signifying life and the descent of the Spirit, he is a stranger, and all who hear and follow his teaching. “Teach me thy ways, O Lord,” should be the prayer of every honest mind, wishing to know the will of God to man. Truth would respond, Amen.

In concluding this chapter we remark, that the word wash, as used by Josephus and Justin Martyr, in reference to baptism, in the outset of this chapter, will be properly understood from the following facts. Acts xvi, 33: “He took them the same hour of the night and washed their stripes.” Job ix, 30: “If I wash myself in snow water, and make my hands never so clean.” Songs of Solomon v, 12: “His eyes are as the eyes of doves by the rivers of waters, washed with milk.” From these passages we see that the application of a fluid to the stripes of Paul and Silas, the application of snow water to the hands of Job, and the application of milk to eyes, are called washings; and in consequence of which, we can at once understand Josephus, when he says John’s baptism was a washing with water, and Justin Martyr, who used similar language. They simply intended to convey the idea, that baptism in their day was neither more nor less than the application of water to the subject. These considerations are presented to show that affusion was practiced in the first two centuries, without doubt, and that immersion was unknown to that time, judging from all
authentic accounts and from the proper use of words.

The true position of immersion is now before the reader. Surely the aspect is any thing but pleasing.

GENERAL REMARKS.

Baptists say that the translators of our version of the Scriptures were forbid to translate the word baptize—that only for this we should have the word immersion instead of the term baptism. This is untrue. The facts in the case are as follows, taken from Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. 1, p. 453. (See Hendrick, p. 85.)

There are other regulations which relate to the translators comparing notes, &c. They were to consult modern translations, such as the Dutch, German, French, Geneva, &c. The commission was dated 1604, but the work was not commenced till 1606, nor finished till 1611. The translation, as it now stands, appeared in 1611, after being revised by Bishop Bilson and Dr. Miles Smith, who wrote the preface.

If these facts are not sufficient to satisfy Baptists that the King and his translators followed the history of the church on the word baptize, perhaps the following thoughts from the New York Recorder, a leading Baptist Journal, will, which run thus:

"We think we have adduced evidence enough to show that the word baptize came as honestly into the language as any other word the language contains." Surely this must be regarded as good testimony by Baptists. Let us then hear eternal silence on the translation.
NO. 1.—CHRIST'S BAPTISM IN JORDAN.

"This," says Taylor, "is a representation, in Mosaic, of the baptism of Christ in Jordan, preserved in the church of Cosmedin, at Ravenna, which was erected A. D. 401." The eye at once perceives that our Savior stands in the edge of Jordan—John standing on a rock, baptizing him by pouring water out of a *patera* (shell) on his head; and, that the Holy Ghost, under the symbol of a dove, is emitting rays of glory and of grace—strikingly illustrative of the Scriptural account of this baptism.

This statement of Basnage will account for the position in the water: "When artists threw garments over pictures of the baptized, they consulted the taste of spectators more than the truth of the fact."

What John holds in his hand as an instrument to baptize with, in this case, is called a *patera* by Ciampini; but it may be a bowl, inasmuch as we find, by turning to John iii, 34, this remarkable language: "He whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not the Spirit *ek metrou* (out of a *measure*) unto him." Thus, it would seem as if John had said, He will not pour the Spirit on him by *measure*, as I do this water in baptism.
NO. II.—ANCIENT MODE OF BAPTISM.

This is taken from Taylor's work on baptism; and the very face of it, without a word of controversy on verbs or prepositions, gives us at once to understand the language of John,—"I indeed baptize you with water." Taylor gives us twelve ancient examples, all of which show baptism by pouring. Five of them represent the Savior in baptism, as found in figure 1. Taylor adds, in view of what could be presented,—"The number might easily be made up to fifty; while, on the contrary, not one instance of plunging can be produced."

Taylor, in contemplating the origin of some of these figures, justly remarks: "The Greek letters prove that they are Greek representations; and their conservation and dedication as spoils of war, mark their origin in a country far distant from Italy, where their evidence on the subject of baptism was not anticipated." They were in existence, as evidences on the mode of baptism, long, long before any of the now contending churches had a name.
NO. III.—THE BAPTISM AT ENON.

This is principally intended to give the reader of the Scriptural account of this baptism a just conception of what John wanted much water for. 2 Chronicles, xxxii, 4: "Why should the King of Assyria come, and find much water?" (polla hudata—many fountains.) Now, if the king had been a Baptist minister, would not Baptists construe the account to signify the idea of immersion in design? The king wanted much water to meet the demands of those around him; and so we say with regard to John. He did not want much water for immersion. Reason forbids the idea. Still, there was an evident necessity for much water, which may be seen by turning to Mark vii, 4, where we learn that the Jews baptized their hands, cups, brazen vessels, and tables. Did they not want much water for this? The Jews, in view of their ablutions or baptisms, would have left any place where John might have been, if found wanting the requisite quantity of water to meet their necessities.

In the background, tents, springs, and individuals are seen, giving us an exposition of the words much water. Bethabara, one of the places where John baptized, lay nearly thirty miles from Jerusalem, and Enon about fifty miles north of this; hence the propriety of the idea of tents, as now found at camp-meetings. Children are seen in the front, waiting for baptism. Christians in Mesopotamia baptized their children by sprinkling, when Wolf appeared among them, stating that they were the true followers of John the Baptist. In short, the face of this cut brings before our minds the following declaration: "For John truly baptized with water." (Acts i, 5.) This gives a true idea of the act here spoken of.