

BAP

~~S653e~~

copy 1

Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No.

SCB
10326





Ad Watrous



EXAMINATION

OF

“SPRINKLING THE ONLY MODE OF BAPTISM
MADE KNOWN IN THE SCRIPTURES, &c. ;
BY ABSALOM PETERS, D. D.”

BY

REV. J. TORREY SMITH, A. M.

I said, days should speak, and multitude of years should teach wisdom. Great men are not always wise: therefore I said, Hearken to me: I also will shew mine opinion.—Job xxxii: 7, 9, 10.

~~~~~

BOSTON:

JOHN PUTNAM, 81 CORNHILL,

1849.

---

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1849,  
BY JOHN PUTNAM,  
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Massachusetts.

---



## CONTENTS.

---

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Introductory, . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 5  |
| Unfortunate representations and statements—<br>“Industrious ignorance”—“Grand error of<br>the Baptists”—“Close Communion”—“A<br>concession”—Greek Church—Modes of<br>sprinkling—Translations of baptizo—Robin-<br>son on Taylor, . . . . .                                             | 7  |
| Meaning of baptizo—“Heathen Greek,”                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 25 |
| “The true question”—Pneuma—Angelos—<br>Arotron, . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 37 |
| Jewish and sacred use of baptizo, . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | 43 |
| Is baptism purification? . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 46 |
| New Testament meaning of baptizo—Incidental<br>use of the word—Baptism of the Holy Ghost<br>—Symbolical import of baptism. Rom. 6 : 3,<br>4. Col. 2 : 12. 1 Cor. 15 : 29. 1 Pet. 3 : 21.<br>—Other figurative allusions to baptism—Bap-<br>tism in the cloud and in the sea, . . . . . | 57 |
| “All questions on the mode of baptism reduced<br>to one,” . . . . .                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 88 |

|                                                                                                                              |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Construction of baptizo—Greek preposition <i>en</i> ,                                                                        | 91  |
| John's baptism, . . . . .                                                                                                    | 99  |
| Baptism of Christ—Greek preposition <i>apo</i> ,                                                                             | 108 |
| Baptism of the 3000—Several similar examples,                                                                                | 111 |
| Baptism of the Eunuch—Greek prepositions <i>eis</i><br>and <i>ek</i> —"Desert"—Isaac's "springs in the<br>desert," . . . . . | 115 |
| Paul buried "in a water-pot of stone," . . . . .                                                                             | 126 |
| Baptism of Cornelius and his friends, . . . . .                                                                              | 126 |
| Baptism of Lydia and her household, . . . . .                                                                                | 127 |
| Baptism of the jailer and his household, . . . . .                                                                           | 127 |
| Baptism in the early church, . . . . .                                                                                       | 129 |
| Jewish proselyte baptism, . . . . .                                                                                          | 138 |
| Alleged impracticability of immersion, . . . . .                                                                             | 146 |
| Remarks on Part II—Covenants—Jewish and<br>Christian Church—Alleged testimony of Jus-<br>tin Martyr, . . . . .               | 150 |
| "Origin of the Baptists"—Historical sketch,                                                                                  | 164 |
| Conclusion—Hint to Pedo-baptists, . . . . .                                                                                  | 179 |



DEDICATION.

---

To the Faculty and Students of Williams College, my revered Alma Mater;—to the esteemed Pastor of the First Congregational Parish in Williamstown, to whose sanctuary parental faithfulness directed my early steps;—and to the People of Williamstown, the place of my birth, the home of my childhood and youth, the following pages are dedicated, with every feeling of respect and interest,

By their friend and servant,

In the ministry of the gospel,

J. T. SMITH.

*Sandisfield, Mass., Oct. 1848.*





# EXAMINATION.

---

## INTRODUCTORY.

The circumstance that Dr. Peters' work on Baptism was written and published, not only in the county of my residence, but also in the place of my birth and education, has very naturally awakened in my mind an interest sufficient to prompt me to a careful reading of it. This interest is not at all diminished by a personal respect which I have ever cherished for its author. In childhood and early youth I knew him as a minister of the gospel, and not unfrequently heard him preach in the pulpit which he now fills, so much to the gratification and profit of his people, when he was settled in a neighboring town. The opportunities I have had of occasionally hearing him in my riper

years, and the reading of the very able periodical of which he was for a considerable time the senior editor, have only strengthened those early favorable impressions. I could, therefore, have willingly been spared the necessity I feel of animadverting upon this work. My personal regard for its author would prompt me to silence; a greater regard which I owe to our common Lord and to the cause of truth, equally dear I trust to us both, impels me to write.

In making these animadversions, I must speak freely. No merely personal considerations ought to prevent my doing it. Still I trust I shall not lose sight of the fact that Dr. Peters had grey hairs upon his head when I entered manhood, nor forget what is due to his mature experience from my comparative inexperience. And I here, once for all, disclaim any feelings towards him but those of sincere respect, both as a man, a Christian, and a minister of the gospel.

The book, I am bound to believe, contains his well considered opinions on the subject of which it treats, which he cherishes for reasons unquestionably satisfactory to himself. Yet I feel obliged to say—and I say it in all candor

—it abounds with assumptions and unproved assertions. Some of these appear to me so destitute even of *plausibility*, that the reader must not be surprised if I speak of them in a tone of decisiveness, bordering upon abruptness. As my object in writing is the defence of what I believe to be truth against important error, I cannot do otherwise than write with plainness and decision.

I regret to find some expressions which betray an apparently uncandid and unkind feeling towards those against whom the doctor is writing—exceptions perhaps to the general tenor of the book. Some of these, in connection with several miscellaneous topics, will now be noticed.

#### UNFORTUNATE REPRESENTATIONS AND STATEMENTS.

The Doctor, in the appendix, quotes with an expression of approbation, a passage from the editor of Calmet's Dictionary, beginning with the following sentence:—"Before we can discuss a theological subject, we must clear away those perversions in which *industrious ignorance* and criminal presumption involve it." I give the italics as I find them. Now the least

I can say about this sentence is, that it was in bad taste, both for Mr. C. Taylor to write it and Dr. Peters to quote it. Perhaps if he had not quoted it, we should not have noticed the following on p. 18. "Learning and *ignorance*, simple piety and *sectarian zeal*, have all been deeply and perseveringly engaged in its investigation."

It is an old and common proverb, "It is hard twitting upon facts." That Baptists are "*ignorant*" enough, I am not going to deny. But I say it is not very fraternal for our more highly favored brethren to twit us of it. Is it not a little in the spirit of the elder brother in the parable? It is still worse when they allow that we are "*industrious*." The wise man says, "there is more hope of a *fool*, than there is of him who is *wise in his own conceit*." There surely is some hope of the Baptists, if they feel their "*ignorance*" enough to be "*industrious*." And we surely ought to expect that our brethren who are favored with "*learning*," would rather encourage our "*industrious*" attempts to be relieved from the charge of "*ignorance*." But if they meet us with the taunt of "*industrious ignorance*," they must not be surprised if we use that industry in a very tho-



rough canvassing of their condescending attempts to enlighten us.

Dr. P. says, (p. 128,) "The grand error of our Baptist brethren, after all, is this: not that they prefer one mode to another; nor that they have adopted the most impracticable and onerous of all modes, which on that account they call the '*cross of Christ*,' when, in fact, it is only a cross of their own making; nor that they practise a mode for which there is no direct authority in the scriptures—but it is that they make the MODE THE ESSENTIAL THING IN BAPTISM." Now I pronounce this, at once, a most disreputable begging of the whole question, and a gross calumny upon us. The grand charge is preceded by three others. First, we "prefer one mode to another." Again and again have we disclaimed all controversy about modes. We have a greater work to do. BAPTISM ITSELF is at stake; and shall we stop to differ about modes? Show us that sprinkling is a MODE of baptism, and we differ no longer. Again, we "have adopted the most impracticable and onerous of all modes, which on that account," &c. Is this candid? Have we selected the most onerous among several equally allowable modes, and insisted upon it? Do we

not insist on immersion, not because it is a **MODE** of baptism, but because it is **BAPTISM ITSELF**, and **THE THING** required? Admit that we are in error here; still so long as it is our candid belief, religiously held, we are not open to the astounding charge here attempted to be fastened on us. Again, we “practise a mode for which there is no direct authority in the scriptures.” The very point in dispute. “But it is that they make the **MODE THE ESSENTIAL THING IN BAPTISM.**” Can Dr. P. have read a single book on baptism by a Baptist writer, and make this statement? Again I say, we have no dispute about the **MODE**; all we ask is **THE THING**. Our position is, that immersion is not a **MODE**, but **THE THING ITSELF**. Whether we are right or wrong in this position, so long as this is our position, to say that we make the mode the essential thing in baptism, is an unfounded calumny.

This alleged pertinacity of ours about the *mere mode* of baptism, is illustrated on p. 120, by the ordinance of the supper. It is said, that when this ordinance was instituted, the apostles “met in the *night—on Thursday—in an upper chamber, of a private dwelling*; they used *unleavened bread*, and the *pure juice* of

the grape, and received it *half sitting*, and *half lying*." Does not the reader see, that there is no comparison between these two cases? All that is *commanded* in this ordinance, is that *bread* and *wine* be eaten, and drank, with prayer, and in a devout spirit, in grateful remembrance of Christ's death. This is all that is expressed or implied in the words which contain the account of the institution of this ordinance. But now, suppose some Christians should claim that the use of bread and wine in this ordinance, is only a *mode* of observing it, and that the use of apples and milk is *another mode*, and suppose these Christians should say that Dr. Peters, in contending for bread and wine, is contending for a mere mode; would he admit that charge? He would say, these elements are *commanded*; so far as relates to the external act in this ordinance, the use of these is not a *mode*, but *the thing*. This is a parallel case. This is what we say about immersion. If sprinkling were a *mode* of baptism—if the laws of language would allow us to admit that *baptizo* may be translated *sprinkle*, we should have no controversy on the outward form of baptism.

Dr. P. uses the expression on p. 22, "close

*communion Baptists.*” Similar expressions are found elsewhere. Is this candid? Did he suppose that this expression would give his reader a particle of light on any subject whatever, or that it would have any effect whatever except to excite groundless prejudice against us? As painful as such a conclusion is, have we not good reason to conclude that he used it precisely for this purpose?

The term close communion, if it have any meaning at all, (and it can hardly be said to have,) means *restricted communion*. And what evangelical denomination is there, that does not restrict its communion? We invite to the communion none whom we deem unbaptized; does Dr. Peters invite to his communion those whom he deems unbaptized? and does not every evangelical denomination restrict its communion as far as that? Dr. Griffin says, “Should a pious Quaker so far depart from his principles as to wish to commune with me at the Lord’s table while he yet refused to be baptized, I could not receive him; because there is such a relationship established between those two ordinances that I have *no right to separate them.*” He adds, “The *only question then is*, whether baptism by sprinkling is valid

baptism." He then does just what we should expect Dr. Griffin would do; not to rail at us—for he always cherished a warm regard for Baptists—but to give reasons for believing sprinkling to be valid baptism. Now will Dr. Peters object to this principle as stated by Dr. Griffin? But this is precisely our principle. In our hands indeed, it cuts off more christians from our communion than it would in Dr. Griffin's or Dr. Peters' hands; but the principle is the same. We exclude Pedeo-baptists from our communion, for the same reason that they exclude Quakers or any body else whom they consider unbaptized; viz. because we think *them* unbaptized, and because we consider that "there is such a relationship established between these two ordinances, that we have NO RIGHT to separate them."

I contend that so far as *closeness* goes, our brethren are more "*close*" than we are. We exclude from our communion all whom we deem unbaptized. They exclude all whom they deem unbaptized, and cry "*close communion!*" upon us. But is that all? No. They exclude from their communion a large class of persons whom they claim to have *solemnly baptized into the church*, in the name of the Father, Son, and

Holy Ghost! Dr. P. (p. 158,) in common with Dwight, Miller, Stearns, and most other Pede-baptist writers, claims that baptized children are members of the church. Here then is a large and interesting class of *baptized church members*, whom their pastors and brethren will not admit to the communion! See Matt. vii. 3, 4.\*

On p. 124, after stating the fact that Baptist missionaries in their versions of the scriptures into heathen languages, *translate* the words *baptizo* and *baptisma*, instead of *transferring* them, the Doctor adds, "They eschew the very words baptize and baptism, in all their translations." A new idea truly! Translating a word is *eschewing* it! When missionaries of all denominations translate the word *metanoeo*, (repent) on the supposition that they are giving that word to the heathen, it seems they thereby *eschew* the word. The christian world have been congratulating themselves on their success in *giving* the Bible to the heathen, because it is *translated* into so many

---

\* For a full elucidation of the subject of communion, so far as it is a controverted subject, see "Remington on Communion," a tract published by L. Colby & Co., New York. It is the best and most conclusive treatise that I know of on that subject.

languages. But now it turns out, that in doing this, they have *eschewed* the whole Bible!

But now as to this matter of “eschewing,” let us see how the case stands between Baptists and Pedo-baptists. Baptists translate these words, therefore they eschew them. Pedo-baptists do not translate these words, therefore they do not eschew them. But they translate all the rest of the Bible, except these words. Now since *translating* a word is *eschewing* it, it follows indisputably that our brethren *eschew* the WHOLE BIBLE, except the words *baptize* and *baptism*!

He adds, “I name this fact as a *concession* on the part of our Baptist brethren, perfectly satisfactory, that they do not regard our present translation of the Bible as justifying, or even *favoring* immersion”! Is not this profound reasoning? Such Baptist ministers as defend their views simply from the English Bible are “*ignorant.*” “Our best philologists have abundantly proved,” &c. But when we take him up on the testimony of those philologists and follow him into the original—what then? “A *concession!*” “Perfectly satisfactory!” “They admit that the English Bible is entirely against them!”

If I chose to descend to it, I could produce many such concessions from Dr. P's book. For example :—On p. 13, the Doctor tells us that he uses the word *sprinkling* in his book in preference to *aspersion*, *affusion*, or *pouring*, (and of course in preference to *immersion*,) because it is a better translation (not of *baptizo*, let the reader mark, but) of *RANTIZO*; and that he uses the word *sprinkling* according to the original signification (not of *baptizo*, but) of *rantizo*, which is, *to pour all over; to wet; to besprinkle*. Of course, it must follow, that he always reads the words *baptize* and *baptism* in the Bible, *rantize* and *rantism*; and if he could have a Bible which fully met his views, the words *rantize* and *rantism* would always be used, where the words *baptize* and *baptism* now occur. “I name this fact as a *concession* on the part of” Dr. Peters, “perfectly satisfactory, that he does not regard our present Bible,” either in the original or the translation, “as justifying or even *favoring*” sprinkling. I name it also as a concession on his part, that instead of the name *Baptist* being an appropriate one for him, (see p. 124) his proper appellation would be *Rantist*. Now I appeal to the reader, if I have not fixed a concession upon



him, as clearly sustained, to say the least, as the one he attempts to fasten upon us.

On p. 21, Dr. P. tells us that the Greek church cannot be claimed as the exclusive supporters, of either *immersion* or *sprinkling*, because they, after immersing the subject three times, sprinkle him with water.

As this matter of *sprinkling* in the Greek church was entirely new to me, I addressed a letter to Rev. H. T. Love, of North Adams, who, having been for several years a missionary in Greece, is well acquainted with the usages of that church. I received a letter from him in reply, of which the following is the essential part.

*North Adams, Sept. 13, 1848.*

Rev. and dear Brother:—

You say that the Rev. Dr. Peters, of Williamstown, in his book entitled, “*Sprinkling the only Mode of Baptism made known in the Scriptures,*” makes the statement *that the Greek church SPRINKLE the candidate, after they have immersed him, and that, therefore, the practice of that church cannot be claimed as the exclusive supporter of either mode.* You inquire for the correctness of this statement.

In reply I would say, that during my residence of something more than six years in Greece Proper, and in the Ionian Islands, I was familiar with all the modes of worship of the Greek church, and I never saw any *sprinkling*, either ecclesiastical or secular, which in the Greek language was called *baptism*. I have witnessed the ceremony of baptizing their children, and never saw any *sprinkling* whatever on the occasion. I have frequently examined the service of the Greek church in reference to the ordinance of baptism, as contained in their ecclesiastical books. There is no mention whatever of sprinkling there. It is uniformly immersion. Dr. Peters would certainly have done well, if he had given us his authority for this most remarkable statement.

I am, my dear brother,

Yours affectionately,

HORACE T. LOVE.

Dr. P. adds, “The Roman Catholic church, whose example is quite as worthy of imitation, practice only sprinkling so far as water is used.” True, but the Roman Catholic church admits that the primitive baptism was immer-

sion, but that she, by the authority with which Christ has invested her, has CHANGED it. If any body thinks that an example worthy of imitation, let them follow it. For ourselves, we have nothing to do with *imitating* either of those churches. All we ask of the Greek church is its TESTIMONY as to the meaning of the Greek word *baptizo*; and we have the testimony of both that and the Catholic in our favor.

The Doctor on p. 21 speaks somewhat complacently of the unanimity of opinion in reference to the *mode of sprinkling*, among those who practice it, in contrast with an alleged diversity of opinion in reference to the *mode of immersion* among those who practice that. Now I presume that our brethren have too much sense to make a diversity of practice in sprinkling a matter of *dispute*, still it will not be denied, that there is as great a diversity among them as can be shown among the advocates of immersion. Sometimes the "sprinkling" is done by *pouring* water from a bowl upon the head of the candidate; sometimes it is done by the administrator dipping his hand thrice in a basin, and giving the subject a *trine* sprinkling; sometimes the candidate is

sprinkled but once; and sometimes the “*sprinkling*” is done without any sprinkling at all,—the minister dipping the ends of his fingers and laying them on the forehead or head; or again dipping the fore finger, and making the sign of the cross. Still there is no *dispute* among them, and I do not know of any among Baptists about the mode of immersion. Tunkers are not Baptists; and we have no dispute with them about triple forward immersion. Campbellites are not Baptists; we neither concede them the name, nor do they claim it. If Campbellites and Tunkers choose to dispute, it concerns us as little as the disputes between Old and New School Presbyterians. That Campbellites agree with us in the outward form of baptism, is to us a mere trifle in comparison with the damning error which they hold in common with the Episcopal church, and such other Pedobaptists as will send for a minister in the night, to sprinkle a child lest it should die without baptism,—*the saving efficacy of baptism*.

Dr. P. in giving the meaning of *rantizo*, on p. 13, I infer quotes from Donnegan’s Lexicon, because he gives the meanings as they are laid down there, *verbatim, et literatim, et*

*punctuatim*. Now I certainly shall not dispute those definitions. I would simply ask, if Donnegan is good authority on the meaning of *rantizo*, why is he not, also, on the meaning of *baptizo*? If he is to be believed, when he says *rantizo* means *to pour all over; to wet; to besprinkle*; why should he not be when he says *baptizo* means *to immerse repeatedly into a liquid; to submerge,—to soak thoroughly,—to saturate*?

It is moreover worthy of notice, that the Doctor labors to show that *baptizo* and *rantizo* are synonymous words. But did any mortal ever see a lexicon which defined those two words in the same terms? or which defined *baptizo* in the terms in which Donnegan defines *rantizo*? Never. But if they are synonymous, they ought to be defined in the same terms. Every lexicographer who regarded them as synonymous, would so define them. But that lexicographer is yet to be found.

Dr. P. has very appropriately dedicated his book to the Faculty and Students of Williams College; and it might be interesting to some who have graduated at that college, to know how far the gentleman who now fills the Greek

chair, concurs in the philological principles of this book. In Professor KELLOGG's day the meaning of *baptizo*, in so much of the Greek classics as was then read, meant nothing but immerse; and to those who enjoyed the rare privilege of his instructions, his opinion would outweigh (begging pardon) that of Dr. Peters, and his friend of Calmet's Dictionary both. I can speak with confidence on this point, for I believe I read every word that belonged to the Greek course while I was there; and the fact is as I have stated.

Dr. P.'s principles of translating Greek particles would have sounded strange in those halls in Prof. KELLOGG's day. That thorough linguist was particular to a proverb, in relation to translating Greek particles. They always had a clear and precise meaning with him. So well understood was this among indolent and superficial students, that one of this class, and something of a wag withal, used to say that "Prof. KELLOGG was preparing for the press a book on the Greek particle *ge*, as large as Donnegan's Lexicon."

On p. 43 Dr. P. says, "The transfer of this word *baptism* into the English Bible was only calling the thing by its right name. It had *no*

*other name in any language.*” He could not have made a very particular inquiry as to the facts in this case before he penned this statement, and for the reader’s benefit I will state them. Rev. F. W. Gotch, of Trinity College, Dublin, published a few years since a pamphlet, showing the rendering of the word *baptizo* in the ancient and modern versions of the New Testament. From this it appears that the ordinance of baptism had some other name than that, *in every language* in which the New Testament had been translated previously to the appearance of our version, *except seven*. In seventeen versions, made earlier than ours, the word is rendered immerse; including the Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, Coptic, Armenian, Gothic, German, Danish, Swedish, Dutch, Belgic and Welch. In the Sahidic, Basmuric and Latin Vulgate, *baptizo* is transferred; and also in the earlier English, French, Spanish and Italian; comprising in all eight versions. Six of these, however, may be reduced to two, because they were made in languages which may be regarded as dialects of the Latin, and were translations from that version. Besides these, in two versions it was rendered wash, and in three, cross. So that in all the languages in

which the Bible had been translated, this ordinance had some other name than *baptism*, except the Latin, French, Spanish, Italian and English, and two eastern languages; and in the most of them that name was *immersion*.

In the Appendix, p. 189, Mr. C. Taylor gives us a rare definition of immerse. "A man is *immersed* who stands on his toes, or up to his knees in water." This must be new to "plain men." As Mr. T. calls the term "bad Latin," we will inquire what it is in Latin. Leverett's Lexicon defines *immergo*, to plunge into, immerse, dip in, sink. Webster defines the English word *immerse*, to put under water or other fluid, to plunge, to dip. According to these authorities, a man cannot be immersed in water, without being *put under water*. If his toes are covered with water, his toes are immersed; if he stands up to his knees in water, his feet and legs are immersed; but the man is not immersed. A man who makes so self-evident a blunder the starting point of his argument, cannot, in his own eyes, have much difficulty in proving any thing.\*

---

\* After observing the high commendation which Dr. Peters has given to this Mr. C. Taylor, it might be interesting to the reader to understand the estimate which Prof. Robinson,



## MEANING OF BAPTIZO.

Dr. Peters is not quite accurate in giving the position of the Baptists. He says (p. 20) that we “strenuously maintain that the primary *classical* meaning of *baptizo* is to *immerse* or *dip*,” and that “on this ground, principally,” we “contend that *immersion and nothing else is baptism*.” We maintain that the primary and proper meaning of *baptizo*,

---

the editor of the American edition of Calmet's Dictionary places upon him. He says in his preface:—“The character of Mr. Taylor as an editor, and the value of his additions to Calmet's work, may be given in few words. Acquainted with oriental philology only through the meagre system of Masclef and Parkhurst; as an expounder of etymologies, outstripping even the extravagance of the latter; and as a theorist in the ancient history of nations, overstepping the limits which even Bryant had felt himself constrained to observe;—his remarks on these, and many collateral topics, may be characterized as being in general fanciful, very often rash, and sometimes even involving apparent absurdity. They must ever be received by the student with great caution.” With the specimen before us which Dr. Peters has given of Mr. C. Taylor, no one can doubt the perfect accuracy of Prof. Robinson's estimate of him. It is indeed with much truth that Dr. Peters has said that his book does not depend on great names; Mr. C. Taylor is his greatest. He must search a good while to find great names to sanction the proposition that sprinkling is the only mode of baptism made known in the scriptures.

both in *classical, Jewish and sacred Greek*,—in any and every kind of Greek that has any title to be quoted as authority, is to *immerse*; and it is on this ground we contend that *immersion* and nothing else is baptism.

Baptists believe that the “command to *baptize* has a *definite meaning*,—a meaning which was understood by those to whom it was primarily addressed, and which *ought to be understood* by us;” (p. 15,)—that “the single word *baptizo* defines the ordinance.” (p. 17.) Our first inquiry therefore is, What does this word *baptize* mean? And since it “is not with us vernacular,” (p. 17,) since this word is Greek, not translated but only *transferred* into the English Bible, (pp. 42, 123,) we conclude the surest way to ascertain its meaning, is to resort to those who used this language, and to whom this word was vernacular. And when Dr. Carson on the side of the Baptists, and Prof. Stuart on the side of the Pedobaptists, have each for himself, and independent of the other, made a thorough exploration of the whole range of classical literature, and perfectly agreed as to the results of that examination, that this word never means in classical Greek any thing else but *immerse* or *over-*

*whelm*, we conclude that one important step has been taken towards settling the meaning of the word baptize, in the commission of our Lord. But now Dr. Peters tells us, that is all labor lost! Dr. Carson and Prof. Stuart supposed that they were doing the Christian world a service, in establishing the meaning of *baptizo* in the classics. Simple men, they might just as well have been rummaging the Hindoo shasters, so far as doing any thing to settle this controversy is concerned! *The entire agreement* of two such men on this point, is of no importance whatever! All their labor was on the “*mistaken assumption* that it is in point,” for “in fact it has little or nothing to do with the subject!” It is “*heathen Greek!*” (p 22.) It is a pity that Dr. Carson and Prof. Stuart could not have been told of this in season, and so have been saved those hours of painful poring over old Greek books.

Now it must be allowed that this is a very summary, if not conclusive way of disposing of an argument. Classical Greek is “*heathen Greek!*”—“has little or nothing to do with the subject!” I venture to say that if classical Greek made any show of proving that *baptizo* means *sprinkle*, we should hear nothing

about the irrelevancy of *heathen* Greek. On such an artifice comment is unnecessary.

This again would have been a queer sound within the walls of Williams College eight or ten years ago. *Heathen Greek!* It is true we were well aware that Homer, Herodotus, Xenophon, Sophocles, Thucidides, Demosthenes were heathens, but it never once occurred to us that their elegant pages were *heathen Greek*. Some of us were looking forward to the work of the ministry, and supposed, and our instructors encouraged us to believe, that we were doing something to prepare ourselves for the sacred office. Poor dupes! We were merely studying *heathen Greek!*

Had the Doctor been content with affirming that the classical meaning of *baptizo* is wholly irrelevant, I might have taken him as conceding that its classical meaning is solely immerse, and so have been spared the necessity of proving it. But he devotes half a page to the *assertion* that it means in the classics, *to tinge, to dye, to smear, &c.*, as well as to immerse. Now I shall be obliged to spend as much time in proving that his assertion is unfounded, as if he had attempted to prove its truth; for I think its classical meaning does

have some bearing upon its meaning in the New Testament.

He says, "The Editor of Calmet's Dictionary quotes some 80 examples, in every one of which, the word in question implies less than *submersion*, and in most of them, no more than *sprinkling*, *moistening*, *pouring*, or *staining*." Without seeing any more of the book referred to than the specimen given us in the appendix, I venture the assertion that the word *baptizo* does not occur in a single example which has any show of proving what is here affirmed. Mr. C. Taylor, in the passage in the appendix, undertakes to show by divers examples the meaning of *baptize* in the New Testament. And how does he do it? By citing several instances of the use of the verb *bapto*, and the noun *baptismos*, neither of which are employed in the New Testament to designate the ordinance of baptism. And that is the way that Pedo-baptists always manage this controversy. They prove that *bapto* means *to tinge*, *to dye*, or *to smear*, and then triumphantly exclaim, that *baptizo* does not always mean *immerse*! In all their books which contain passages cited from Greek authors designed to shew that BAPTIZO means something short of IMMERSE, the

*word is not BAPTIZO but BAPTO. This I know from an examination of many of those books. But BAPTO is not the word used to designate this rite; it is always BAPTIZO.*

Now I will prove from Prof. Stuart, what the classical meaning of both these words is, established by a great number of passages cited by him. And I suppose I need not inform the reader that Prof. Stuart is a Massachusetts Congregationalist, for a long time the virtual head of Andover Seminary, the father of biblical learning in this country, and of a world-wide reputation for varied and extensive learning. I shall give the results only of his investigation, and in his own words.

“1. *Bapto* and *baptizo* mean to dip, plunge, or immerse into any thing liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this.

“2. The verb *bapto* means to plunge or thrust into any thing solid, but permeable, so as to cover or enclose the thing plunged. This is exclusively employed in such cases.

“3. The verb *bapto*, only, is employed to convey the meaning to dip out, to dip up, by plunging in a vessel and drawing it up.

“4. The verb *bapto*, ONLY, (and its deriva-

tives in point of form,) signifies to TINGE, DYE, OR COLOR. *In this respect it seems plainly to differ from baptizo. I find no instance in which the latter is employed in this way.*

“5. The word *baptizo* means to *overwhelm*, literally and figuratively, in a variety of ways.

“6. *Bapto* is employed in the sense to SMEAR, to BATHE, by the application of a liquid to the surface.

“7. A shade of meaning kindred to the above, viz. to *wash*, is sometimes attached to *bapto* in the classics.”

He adds, “*The Greek writers made a DISTINCT and DIVERSE use of the words BAPTO and BAPTIZO, NEVER CONFOUNDING THEM.*” The reason why Dr. Peters says that *baptizo* means to *tinge*, to *dye*, to *smear*, &c. in the classics, is that he CONFOUNDS it with *bapto*. The reader will see that Prof. Stuart gives but two definitions to *baptizo*. 1. To dip, plunge, or immerse into any liquid. 2. To overwhelm, literally and figuratively.

While Prof. Stuart was writing this essay, Dr. Carson in England, was publishing his work on baptism, in which he arrives at precisely the same results as to the meaning of those words that Prof. Stuart does. He shows,

in entire agreement with Prof. Stuart, that the primary meaning of *bapto* is to dip or immerse, but because in dyeing, the substance to be colored is ordinarily dipped into the coloring liquid, this word has the secondary signification of *tinge, dye, smear, &c.*; and he also shows, in perfect agreement with Prof. Stuart, that *baptizo* in the classics never has that secondary signification, but always means *immerse* or *overwhelm*.

Now I put it to "plain men," whether it is candid and honest in Pedit-baptist ministers to represent that *baptizo* means to *tinge, dye, smear, moisten, wet*, because *bapto* may admit those significations, after two such men on both sides have so conclusively settled the clear distinction between those words, and PROVED that *baptizo* in the classics *never has those significations*? Dr. Peters may perhaps say, he is not bound by Prof. Stuart's admissions. But he is bound by what Prof. Stuart has PROVED, unless he proves the reverse. If not, how is this controversy ever to be settled? If important points, *admitted* and *proved* by two such writers on both sides, are to be brought up again in the form of naked assertion, and reiterated again and again, how shall we ever come to



agree upon any thing? I must say to my Pede-baptist brethren, it requires a great stretch of charity to believe that they have any desire to settle this controversy, from the manner in which they conduct it.

I here say, once for all, I shall spend no time disputing with any man about *bapto*. It is not the word in question, and has nothing to do with the subject.

Dr. P. refers to "our best philologists," which I suppose means Pede-baptist philologists. I have quoted from one, Prof. Stuart, and to show the utter groundlessness of his assertion, I will add the testimony of a few others—all Pede-baptists.

My second citation shall be from Dr. Robinson, acknowledged to be among biblical scholars and critics in this country like Saul among his people—head and shoulders above them. He is referred to by Dr. P., and quoted as high authority, on p. 29. In his Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament, a work absolutely without a rival in the language, the following are the only definitions given of *baptizo*: "To immerse, to sink. In the New Testament, 1. To wash, to cleanse by washing. 2. To administer the rite of bap-

tism. Metaphorically and in allusion to the sacred rite of baptism, to baptize IN the Holy Ghost and IN fire, to overwhelm, richly furnish with all spiritual gifts, or overwhelm in unquenchable fire.”

Prof. Patton, of Princeton College, edited an American edition of Donnegan's Greek and English Lexicon, in which *baptizo* is thus defined: “To immerse repeatedly into a liquid, to submerge, to soak thoroughly, to saturate, hence to drench with wine. Metaphorically to confound totally;—to dip in a vessel and draw.”

So far American philologists. Passing beyond the ocean, I will refer to the following. Greenfield's New Testament Lexicon: “To immerse, immerge, submerge, sink; in the New Testament, to wash, to perform ablution, to cleanse, to immerse, to administer the rite of baptism.”

Scapula, author of a very celebrated European Lexicon, defines *baptizo* thus: “Mergo, seu immergo; ut quæ tingendi aut abluendi gratia aqua immergimus. Item mergo, submergo, obruo aqua. Item abluo, lavo;”—which I translate thus: “To plunge or immerse; as things which for the sake of dyeing or washing, we immerse in water. Also to

plunge, submerge, overwhelm with water. Also to wash off, to bathe.”

Schleusner's, another celebrated New Testament Lexicon, a standard work both in Europe and America, gives the following definitions of *baptizo*: “1. Proprie: immergo ac intingo, in aquam mergo. Respondit Hebraico *tabal*. Jam quia haud raro aliquid immergi ac intingi in aquam solet ut lavetur, hinc, 2, abluo, lavo, aqua purgo, notat. 3. Hinc transfertur ad baptismi ritum solemnem. 4. Imbuo, large et copiose do atque suppedito, largiter profundo. 5. Calamitatum fluctibus obrui, mergi miseriis, mala perferre, etiam sponte se periculis vitæ offerre, mortem adeo ipsam sibi inferre pati.” Translation: “1. Properly to immerse and dip in, to plunge into water. It answers to the Hebrew *tabal*.\* Now BECAUSE not unfrequently a thing is wont to be immersed and dipped into water in order that it may be washed, HENCE, 2, it denotes to perform ablution, to wash, to cleanse with water. 3. Hence it is transferred to the rite of baptism. 4. To imbue, to give and supply largely and copiously, to pour out largely—

---

\* See Dr. P., p. 48.

(spoken of the baptism of the Holy Ghost.) 5. To be overwhelmed with the waves of calamities," &c.

Dr. George Campbell, Principal of Marischal College, of Aberdeen University, author of the profound Philosophy of Rhetoric, Dissertations, Translation and Notes on the Gospels, the successful antagonist of Hume in his famous argument on miracles, to whom Dr. P. refers with approbation, on p. 29, says, "The word *baptizo*, both in sacred and classical authors, signifies to dip, to plunge, to immerse, and is always construed suitably to this meaning."

Beza, who, says Prof. Stuart, is one of the most acute judges of Greek idioms, says, "*Baptizo* does not signify to wash, except by consequence. To be baptized in water signifies no other than to be immersed in water; which is the external ceremony of baptism." The German critics who give the same testimony in relation to this word are too numerous to mention; all Pedo-baptists, let the reader remark. Bretschneider, declared by Pres. Sears to be confessedly the most critical lexicographer of the New Testament, says, "*An entire immersion belongs to the nature of baptism. This is the meaning of the word.*"

I will only add to this list, Dr. Anthon, the great classical scholar of New York, who says, “*No scholar could, without injuring his reputation, give the signification of sprinkle to baptizo.*”

Now whether the classical meaning of *baptizo* has any thing to do with this question or not, I think I am entitled to say, I have *proved* that it is solely immerse, or overwhelm.

#### THE TRUE QUESTION.

After affirming that the classical meaning of *baptizo* has no bearing upon the subject, Dr. P. proceeds to state, (p. 23,) *what the true question is*. And here, where we should expect great precision, there is either an extraordinary looseness of language, or a still more extraordinary intimation. “The true question is: what was, *and is*, the meaning of the word *baptizo*, as used in the New Testament, to designate the religious ordinance of baptism?” “What was, *and is*.” Does the Doctor mean to insinuate that the meaning of *baptizo* *is* any different from what it *was*? Has it changed since the commission to baptize was given? If not, then its meaning *is* what it *was* when that

commission was given. Omitting the phrase "and is," I accept the statement.

The Doctor proceeds by labored, though most unfortunate illustrations, to show what no mortal could be simple enough to deny; viz. that if any Greek word used by Christ had changed in its signification between the time, say of Homer and the time of Christ, Christ used it, not in its Homeric sense, but in the current sense of his day. Dr. Campbell and Prof. Robinson are brought in (p. 29,) to prove this self-evident proposition. But now the important question of *fact* arises, does the word *baptizo* fall within the range of this self-evident proposition? In classical Greek this word expressed a definite physical act; did it express any different physical act in the time of Christ? or did it express that same physical act with any less distinctness? And it so happens that these two witnesses have not only testified as to the principle in question, but also as to the question of fact arising under the principle. Dr. Campbell testifies that "*the sacred use and the classical, ARE OFTEN VERY DIFFERENT.*" Agreed, say I; but, Dr. Campbell, *are the sacred and the classical use of baptizo different?* No, promptly responds Dr. P.'s witness—

“ *The word baptizo, BOTH IN SACRED AND CLASSICAL AUTHORS, signifies to dip, to plunge, to immerse, and is ALWAYS construed suitably to this meaning. Had baptizo been employed in the sense of raino, I sprinkle, which, so far as I know, it NEVER IS IN ANY USE, SACRED OR CLASSICAL,*” &c. Will Dr. P. and his brethren accept Dr. Campbell’s testimony on the *fact* as well as on the *principle*? Prof. Robinson testifies to the same principle. Agreed as before. But now how is the *fact* in relation to the word *baptizo*? and Prof. Robinson’s lexicon tells us all about this, as we have seen already.

The Doctor, in unfolding this principle of interpretation, introduces an illustration that we must call *windy*, if not worse. He tells us, (p. 25,) “ The word *pneuma, spirit*, in the most ancient Greek, meant *wind* or *breath*, and nothing further.” Is he willing to stake his reputation, as a learned man, on the declaration that the word *pneuma*, in classical Greek, means nothing but wind? Stephanus, in his thesaurus, says that it means *spirit* as well as *wind*, and quotes examples from Aristotle, Sophocles and Plutarch. It was used then by “ heathen ” Greek writers, hundreds of years

before the New Testament was written, in precisely the same manner that it is used in the New Testament—to signify *wind* and SPIRIT. This Greek word is precisely equivalent to the Hebrew *ruach*, and the Latin *spiritus*, and all of them primarily mean *breath*, but were employed by those who used those languages to express the metaphysical idea of *spirit*. I suppose it is well understood by all men who make any pretensions to learning, that all metaphysical ideas are expressed by words, that, in their primary import, express physical ideas.

The illustration on the word *angelos*, is as little to the point. Its classical meaning is messenger, and this is precisely its meaning in the New Testament. It is applied to Angels, who are God's *messengers*, sent forth to minister to the heirs of salvation. It is applied to John the Baptist—to the *messengers* sent by John to Christ—to the spies concealed by the harlot Rahab—and to Paul's thorn in the flesh ; and the instances in which it occurs in the Greek of the Old Testament are too numerous to mention. It is the word usually employed where the word *messenger* occurs in our version.



But the crowning illustration is on the word *arotron*, the Greek for *plow*. If the "plain" reader will look into Webster, he will find the following definition of *plow*: "An instrument for turning up, breaking and preparing the ground for receiving the seed. It is drawn by oxen or horses, and saves the labor of digging." Now I suppose that if the first Greek who invented and used an *arotron*, had been asked to *describe* what he called by that name, he would have done it just as Dr. P. *defines* it; but if he had been asked to *define* it, he would have done it much as Dr. Webster *defines* the English word *plow*. That would be the precise and proper definition of *arotron*, when the "old Roman plow" was first invented. But just look at the Doctor's *definition* of *arotron*: "A straight stick of timber, sharpened at one end, with a clevis at a suitable distance from the sharpened point, by which it was drawn, while it was steered by a man at the other end of the stick." That is as philosophical as it would be to define man,—*a corporeal being, six feet or more high, with an aquiline nose, and a bald head*, because that would partially describe the outer man of an eminent divine, well known to both Dr. P. and me. But that

would be as unfortunate as the Doctor's definition of *arotron*, since it would leave *both him and me* out of the category of men! The simple truth is, the word *arotron* will apply to the old Roman plow and to the modern Yankee plow, *without the least modification of its meaning.*

So conclusive is Dr. P. in his attempt to prove what nobody would think of denying. *If he, or anybody else, will prove that the word BAPTIZO expressed to those who used the Greek language, whether in the synagogue or the heathen temple, any different physical act, or any less definite physical act, when the commission to baptize was given by our Lord, than it did when used by Homer, Herodotus, or Sophocles, we yield the point at once.* The physical act implied in the ordinance of Christian Baptism must be *that which the word expressed when the command was given.* The Doctor's proof that there is such a change in the meaning of *baptizo*, is about as follows :

The classical and sacred use of some Greek words are different. *Baptizo* is a Greek word. Therefore the classical and sacred use of *baptizo* are different. That is like the following :

Some men died in Sept. 1848. Zachary

Taylor is a man. Therefore Zachary Taylor died in Sept. 1848. Q. E. D.!

#### JEWISH AND SACRED USE OF BAPTIZO.

Dr. P. quotes from Prof. Robinson, (on p. 22,) a principle recognized by all Biblical scholars, that Jewish writers employed *some* Greek words, and *some forms of construction*, in some respects different from their classical use. But where do we find evidence of this principle? We find it by an examination of the Jewish-Greek writers, and a comparison of them with classical Greek. These writers are the *Translators of the Old Testament, in the Septuagint*, (referred to by Dr. P., p. 25,) *the authors of the Apocrypha and Josephus*. Now nobody pretends that *all* Greek words are modified in this Jewish-Greek dialect. All admit that *some* words are, and Dr. P. claims that *baptizo* is. If *baptizo*, in the Jewish-Greek dialect, has any different meaning from what it has in classical Greek, should we not be likely to find it in the Septuagint, Apocrypha and Josephus? But Dr. P. has not cited a single passage from either of these, proving such a fact. Does the reader ask why? I can

give no better reason than that he could not. It is used both literally and figuratively. When used literally, the physical act expressed is *immersion*; when used figuratively, it means *to overwhelm*. Says Dr. Carson, "the language of no writer can have more authority on this subject than Josephus. A Jew, who wrote in the Greek language in the apostolic age, must be the best judge of the meaning of Greek words employed by Jews in his own time. Now this author uses the word *frequently*, and ALWAYS *in the sense of immersion.*" He shows this by numerous examples.

The reader will see that this question is now reduced to a narrow point. *When our Saviour gave the command to baptize, the word BAPTIZO, wherever and by whomsoever spoken or written, whether by Greek or Jew, in Athens, in Alexandria, or in Jerusalem, meant neither less nor more than IMMERSE.* Would he, in instituting a positive ordinance, use a word in a sense different from any use then known, without the least intimation of it? Is that credible? He commands us to be baptized; that is the LAW; but Dr. P. tells us he does not mean *baptize* in that law, he means *rantize*. (Note p. 13.) He labors to show that purifi-

cation by sprinkling is the idea intended to be conveyed. If our Saviour meant this, why did he not *say it*? Had he said *katharizo*, instead of *baptizo*, we should have known that he meant *purify*; and then that long discussion of Dr. P.'s on Jewish purifications, introduced on a "mistaken assumption that *it is in point*, when, in fact, it has little or nothing to do with it," *would have been* relevant. Had he said *rantizo*, then we should have known that "sprinkling is the only mode of baptism made known in the Scriptures." Had he said *brecho*, (to wet) instead of *baptizo*, we should have known that we are at liberty to sprinkle or immerse, at our pleasure. But he used neither of these words. He used *baptizo*, a word that, by the universal consent of the learned, expressed to all who used the Greek language at the time the command was given, THE PHYSICAL ACT OF IMMERSION.

Now if the words employed by our Saviour, in giving the law of baptism, do not inform us what is commanded, we have no means of knowing. A law not expressed in definite language, is no law. If the word used in the historical accounts of baptism do not inform us what physical act was performed in baptism,

we inquire in vain. But Dr. P., abandoning “*heathen*” Greek, abandoning the Septuagint and Apocrypha, abandoning Josephus, has entrenched himself in the New Testament. There let us follow him.

#### IS BAPTISM PURIFICATION ?

Dr. P. (p. 36,) lays the foundation of his scriptural argument in an *assumption* for which not a particle of proof is offered. He refers to Heb. 9: 10, where the expression *diaphorois baptismois*, (*divers baptisms*—in our version, *washings*) occurs. He proceeds to remark, “the reader should here possess himself of definite impressions as to the true nature of these Jewish *purifications* or *baptisms*.” Having thus *assumed* that “*baptisms*” in this verse means *purifications*, and that therefore *purification* is a proper synonyme of *baptism*, he proceeds to reason upon it as if it were a thing *settled* and *proved*. Now the apostle declares that the legal dispensation consisted “in meats and drinks, and *divers baptisms* (*immersions*) and carnal ordinances.” But does he say those *immersions* were *purifications*? No; he says nothing about it. We know, by reading

the law, that the *effect* of these baptisms was ceremonial purification; but the *baptisms themselves* were not purification, and it is a gross confusion of language to say they were. But that is nothing to the purpose. Paul *does not say* this was their effect; he says nothing about their effect. He leaves us to find this out as we can best.

From this assumption a *therefore* follows, p. 38. "The true meaning, *therefore*, of the 'divers baptisms' under the law, and of Christian baptism—the main idea, the thing commanded—is *purification*, or *consecration*. This is the thing signified by the external symbol; and the mode of applying the symbol is comparatively unimportant. This is especially the case in Christian baptism. Hence no particular mode is prescribed in our Saviour's command to his disciples to *baptize*; and the only thing upon which the mind can fasten, in this command, as of divine obligation, is the thing signified by the word *baptize*, which is to *purify*, or to *consecrate*, by the application of water in some mode!" George Fox himself could not have desired nor produced any better Quakerism than that passage. Baptism consists, as the reader

must see, of two parts; *the external symbol*, and *the thing signified*. The thing signified is purification. Now "the only thing upon which the mind can fasten, in the command to baptize, is the thing signified." If the thing signified is all that this law commands, then there is no external symbol commanded; and consequently, NO WARRANT FOR OUTWARD, OR WATER BAPTISM. But perhaps my reader will suggest, that the Doctor says the thing signified is to purify by *the application of water* in some mode. True; but how can he say it, after saying what he has above? If baptism consists of an external symbol and the thing signified, and if there is nothing in the command on which the mind can fasten, except the thing signified, the command cannot reach the external symbol. But what is the "application of water in some mode," if it is not an external symbol? If the external symbol is not commanded, then there is no command for the application of water in some mode—or in any mode. Quakerism, full blown.

He proceeds: "And not only is no precise mode of applying the symbol prescribed in the command, no mode is spoken of afterwards, as binding, or as commanded." I need not



say again, Baptists do not contend for any *mode of baptism*. Dr. P., however, intends to say, that the command to baptize does not prescribe any definite physical act, to the exclusion of all others. But does not the command to baptize, prescribe "the thing" which the word baptize *means*? And if the word *baptize* did express a definite physical act when the command was given, (which I have proved,) does not that command prescribe that definite physical act? And has Dr. P. a right to declare as positively as he does here, that that word did not express any definite physical act when that command was given, on his naked assumption, without a word of proof?

He says further: "And these names (baptism and purification) are synonymous. They mean the same thing. Both in the New Testament, and in the writings of the Christian fathers, they are used interchangeably, the one for the other."

As to this reference to the Fathers, if he will take their instructions on baptism, he will go beyond us, on immersion. He will find that the "regeneration," "remission," "illumination," or "purification" (for the Fathers used each of these names, and several others,

interchangeably with baptism) will require not less than *three immersions*.

Two passages are cited from the New Testament, Luke 11: 38—41. Christ sat down with a certain Pharisee to meat. “And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not washed (*ebaptisthe, baptized himself*) before dinner. And the Lord said unto him, Now do ye Pharisees make clean (*katharizete, purify*) the outside of the cup and platter,” &c. It is evident from this verse, that the superstitious Pharisees immersed themselves whenever they came from any public place, for the sake of purifying themselves from any defilement they might have contracted. The traveller Bruce describes a similar custom as still prevailing among a Jewish sect in Abyssinia. But does this passage prove that *baptize* is synonymous with *purify*? The sacred historian described *precisely the physical or outward act* that the Pharisee wondered Christ did not perform, just as we should expect a faithful historian would; and Christ did just what we should expect the omniscient Saviour would do; directed his answer to what was in the Pharisee’s mind, viz: his superstitious notions on the subject of ceremonial defilement and

purity. The Pharisee evidently observed this custom, for the sake of ceremonial purification, as an effect of the baptism (i. e., immersion). But still *baptizo* is one word, and *katharizo* is another, and each has its own meaning. But suppose Dr. P. has established all that he asserts in this paragraph, what has he proved? Why, that *in the mind of that Pharisee*, these two words were synonymous. Are we then to take Pharisaical superstitions as our guide in Christ's ordinance of baptism?

The second example cited, is from John 3: 25, 26. Let the reader carefully observe the facts there stated. John was baptizing in Enon, near to Salim. A question arose between some of John's disciples and the Jews about *purifying*. The disciples of John came to their Master with the information that Christ was *baptizing*. Now before Dr. P. can make this piece of history serviceable to his theory of baptism, he must prove four things. First, that the subject of debate between John's disciples and the Jews, was the same with the conversation between John's disciples and their Master. The narrative says the one was on *purification*, the other on *baptism*; the one a *question*, the other a *statement of a fact*. If

this be proved, then it will be necessary to show that when the Jews confounded the baptism of John and of Christ with Jewish purifications, they had a correct conception of it. If it should turn out that John's and Christ's baptism was a very different observance from Jewish purifications, their erroneous views would not help Dr. P. any more than the superstitions of the Pharisee in Luke 11. If these two positions shall be made out, then it will be necessary to prove that John's baptism was Christian baptism. If, as Dr. P. maintains, John's baptism is not Christian baptism, though he were to prove that John's baptism was the Jewish rite of purification, that would prove nothing in relation to Christian baptism. And lastly, though it should be proved that both John's disciples and the Jews had correct views of baptism, and whatever they thought of baptism would apply to Christian baptism, the most that would follow would be that purification is an *effect* of baptism, not that it is baptism. It would be far from proving that baptize and purify are synonymous words.

The careful reader of Dr. P.'s book will see that his whole argument to prove that "sprinkling is the only mode of baptism made

known in the scriptures," rests on this assumption that *baptize* means to *purify*; while not a scripture does he adduce to prove it, but these two to which I have just referred. If he has failed to prove this point, his fabric falls. Whether he has proved it, I leave for the candid reader to judge.

The most extraordinary declaration on this point is on p. 41. "*Baptize* is the word which is *more frequently used than purify*, in the Greek of the New Testament, to denote this ordinance." More frequently used! Dare any man say that *purify* is ever used, in one solitary instance, in the Greek of the New Testament to denote the ordinance of baptism? If any man dare say it, he has more daring than I wish to have, in view of such a declaration as that contained in Rev. 22: 18, 19.

The next step in Dr. P.'s argument would be an obvious one. Some of the legal purifications were performed by sprinkling. *Baptize*, therefore, means to *sprinkle*. After citing again Heb. 9: 10, (p. 44,) "*divers baptisms*," he affirms that Paul calls two examples of *sprinkling* referred to by him, *baptism*! Now I beg the reader to bear in mind that the word *baptismos*, in any writer of Greek before

Paul's time, whether heathen or Jewish, never means any thing but *immersion*; have we any right to suppose that Paul uses that word here in a new and unheard of sense? Then read the chapter for yourself, and see whether Paul calls those sprinklings baptisms, or whether that is a naked assertion of Dr. P.'s. Do you say the sprinklings are specifications under the general head of *divers baptisms*? I answer, no. The general heads in verse 10, are three: meats and drinks, divers baptisms, and carnal ordinances. Under these three heads he places the whole legal dispensation. And the specifications which he adduces, must come under the last mentioned of the three heads, viz: carnal ordinances. That is the division which he proceeds to illustrate by examples. We have no right to make *baptismois* in this passage, mean sprinklings, except in the emergency that there were no immersions under the law to which the word can be referred. No matter how many sprinklings the law required; if it required *divers immersions*, *diaphorois baptismois* means the immersions for all the sprinklings.

But says Dr. Peters, (p. 49,) "no immersions of *persons* were enjoined, and the whole

Mosaic ritual as to *personal* ablution, could be fulfilled to the letter without a single immersion." Now I would just observe to the "plain" reader, since we have the law-book in our hands, it might be best to examine this point for ourselves. The following passages may throw some light upon the subject: Ex. 29: 4. 40: 12. Lev 14: 7, 8. 15. 16: 4, 24, 26, 28. 17: 15, 16. 22: 6. Num. 19: 7, 8, 19. Deut. 23: 11. 2 Chron. 4: 6. No less than twelve cases of personal ablution are specified in Lev. 15, in which the persons are required to *bathe themselves in water*; and wherever the word *wash* occurs, it is the same that is translated *bathe*, and according to Maimonides, whom Dr. P. styles "the great interpreter of the Jewish law," it requires a *complete immersion*. His language is, "Wherever in the law, washing of the flesh, or of clothes, is mentioned, it means nothing else than the *immersion of the whole body in a bath*."

This whole argument of Dr. P.'s in relation to purification rests on assumption, and on an unwarrantable confusion of language. *Ceremonial purification was the EFFECT of the immersions and the sprinklings practised by the Jews under the law*; but the words immersion,

or washing, or sprinkling and purification, were not therefore synonymous. But when he says that Christian baptism is purification, what does he mean? Does he mean that it is *ceremonial* purification? Are we then, in the gospel church, practising the old Jewish ordinances? He cannot mean that. Then he must mean *inward* or *spiritual* purification. It must be one of these two. It cannot be the first. Can it be the last? When he says that baptize and purify are synonymous words—that all that the mind can fasten on in the command to baptize is purification, does he mean to say that outward baptism is spiritual purification? Does he even mean that spiritual purification is the EFFECT of outward baptism? Has Dr. P. turned Campbellite?

“But I turn away from this scene of human error and confusion. THE BIBLE, and NOTHING BUT THE BIBLE, is the creed of “Protestants.”\* On the direct declaration of the word of God, I deny that baptism is purification, or that purification is even the *effect* of baptism. In 1 Pet. 3: 21, we are told in so many words, that “baptism is NOT the putting away of the filth of the flesh.” Now I sup-

---

\* p. 119.



pose every reader understands filth of the flesh here, to mean moral defilement, i. e. sin. The putting of that away is spiritual purification. But the apostle says baptism is NOT the putting that away; i. e. it is NOT spiritual purification.

Baptism, as I shall show hereafter, is a SIGN of entire separation from sin, and that includes purification. But because baptism is a *sign* of purification, it by no means follows that it *is* purification. It would be a rare absurdity to say that baptism *is* what it is a *sign of*. Circumcision was a sign of regeneration; will Dr. P. say that it *was* regeneration?

#### NEW TESTAMENT MEANING OF BAPTIZO.

We have followed Dr. P. through his effort to prove that *baptizo* in the New Testament means to *purify*. I shall now show that the New Testament proves the meaning of *baptizo* to be *immerse*, or *overwhelm*. In doing this we must, for the present, leave out of view the historical accounts of baptism, because the object of this investigation is to settle the meaning of that word in the historical accounts. Our sources of information will be

the following: The incidental mentions of the words baptize and baptism—the baptism of the Holy Ghost—the symbolical import of baptism—and the figurative allusions to baptism. The reader will bear in mind that I have proved, mostly by the declarations of Pedo-baptists, that the word baptize, both in classical and Jewish Greek, *up to the writing of the New Testament*, meant immerse only. If I prove what I now affirm, I shall then have established the meaning of *baptizo* in the commission, to be immerse, and nothing else.

1. *The incidental mentions of the words baptize and baptism.*

One of these has already been considered, viz: Heb. 9: 10, where I have shown the meaning to be immersion.

Another is in Mark 7: 3, 4. “For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, *holding the tradition of the Elders*. And when they come from the market, except they baptize themselves, they eat not. And many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the baptism of cups, pots, brazen vessels and couches.”

Dr. P. admits that the cups, pots and brazen

vessels may possibly have been immersed all over in water. But he thinks it improbable. "And to suppose that the *beds* or *couches* were *immersed* would be preposterous, especially if we consider the superstition of the Jews, which led them to practice these purifications many times a day." But where do we learn this? Not surely in this account in Mark; and I know of no authority whatever for the statement.

To what Dr. P. says on pp. 61 and 62, and his friend of Calmet's Dictionary on p. 181, I will oppose the testimony of Maimonides, a celebrated Jewish Rabbi of the 12th century, styled by Dr. P. (p. 135) "*the great interpreter of the Jewish law.*" He says, "Wherever in the law, washing of the flesh or of clothes is mentioned, it means nothing else than the *immersion* of the whole body in a bath." "In a bath, containing forty seahs of water, (100 gallons) every defiled man," (except in certain special cases) "*immerses* himself; and in it they *immerse* all unclean vessels." The requisition to immerse vessels before using them, extended not only to those "bought of the Gentiles," but also to those manufactured by Jews; "care is to be taken about them, lo!

these must be *immersed*." Particular directions are given respecting the *immersion* of cups, pots, kettles, glass and molten vessels, *couches*, &c. "A bed that is wholly defiled, if one immerses it part by part, it is pure." "If the Pharisees but touched the garments of the common people, they were defiled, and needed *immersion*."\*

The reader is desired to notice that Maimonides is here giving the *traditions* of the Jews; and that the evangelist declares that the things mentioned by him were done according to the *tradition* of the Elders. And the proof which I have presented here applies with equal force to Luke 11: 38. Baptize, in all these places, means immerse and nothing else.

## 2. *The baptism of the Holy Ghost.*

Dr. P. justly observes, (p. 81,) "The scriptures represent the baptism of the Spirit and the baptism with water as analogous. The one is the sign or emblem of the other." If, then, outward baptism is a symbol of the baptism of the Spirit, we may with propriety reason from the outward symbol to the spiritual fact. But would it be safe to reason from the spiritual fact to the outward symbol?

---

\* Cited in Turney on Baptism, p. 139.

I know of no writer who has more effectually exposed the grand fallacy of Dr. P., and of all other Pedo-baptist writers, in regard to the baptism of the Holy Ghost, than his friend of Calmet's Dictionary, quoted in the Appendix. One has only to read p. 183 to see the perfect absurdity of arguing that baptize means to *sprinkle*, from the *pouring out* of the Holy Spirit. That writer gives the following words as synonymous with baptize, because all those representations are given of the communicating and receiving of spiritual influences, viz: *Sending down; Coming; Giving; Falling; Shedding; Pouring; Sitting or Abiding, Anointing; Filling; Sealing.* To which the following may be added: *Sprinkling; (Ez. 36: 25. Breathing; (John 20: 22.) Blowing; (John 3: 3, Acts 2: 2, 4.) Emission of sound, or putting forth of the voice; (1 Kings 19: 12, 13.) Shining as the light; (2 Cor. 4: 6.) Drinking; (1 Cor. 12: 13, John 7: 37, 39.)* Now the proposition is, that baptize is synonymous with all these words, because all these words are used to describe giving or receiving spiritual influences! If this is so, the widest latitudinarian could not desire a greater variety of *modes* of baptism than this would give us

The difficulty with Dr. P. would be, that it would fail of proving that "sprinkling is the ONLY mode of baptism MADE KNOWN IN THE SCRIPTURES."

The "plain" reader will feel a desire by this time, I apprehend, "to turn away from this scene of human error and confusion." He cannot help exclaiming, Has God given any foundation in his word for such an absurd medley as this, in the form of instructions in relation to an ordinance which ought to be so plain that the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein?

The grand fallacy of Dr. P. and his friend of Calmet's Dictionary, which has given rise to all this absurdity and confusion, is *the confounding of distinct and separate facts*. They represent the *pouring out* of the Spirit to be the *baptism* of the Spirit; whereas it needs only a little discrimination to see that the *pouring out* is one thing, and the *baptism* another, which follows it. The Doctor tells us about certain water pots containing two or three firkins apiece, where the Jews washed their hands, and performed certain purifications. Obviously, before any purifications could be performed by means of those water pots, they

must have water put into them. Was the *pouring* of water into those pots *purification*? Many persons, for their comfort or health, have a bath in their house where they daily bathe their entire persons. Now before they bathe they must pour water into the bath. Is this *pouring*, the *bathing*? The reader, I trust, can now see that whatever words may be employed to designate the *giving* of the Spirit, none of them would affect the meaning of baptize, because the baptism is a separate fact, which *follows* the giving.

And now let us look at that separate fact—the *baptism* of the Spirit, which followed the *pouring out* of the Spirit—and inquire whether *sprinkling* would be any adequate emblem of it; whether, if that extraordinary manifestation of the Spirit shall be symbolized by any application of water to the outward man, any thing short of an entire immersion would be an adequate symbol? In Acts 2, we are told “suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing, mighty wind, and it FILLED ALL THE HOUSE where they were sitting.” “And they were all FILLED with the Holy Ghost.” The physical idea on which the figure is founded, is that of a substance *immersed*

*in some fluid* which immediately penetrates and fills it.

A scientific writer in the (British) Monthly Review, speaking about the different applications of electricity for the cure of diseases, says: "The first is the electric *bath*; so called, because it *surrounds* the patient with an atmosphere of the electric fluid, in which he is *plunged*, and receives positive electricity." Probably most readers would prefer the word *immerse* here to the word *plunge*. Still I presume that no scientific reader would think this language even unnatural. But if it would not be unnatural to say a person is *plunged* in an electrical atmosphere when he is so entirely *surrounded* with the fluid that he is charged and filled with it, can it be unnatural to say the apostles were *immersed* in the Holy Spirit when they were said to be *surrounded* and FILLED with those influences? Prof. Robinson judges not; he calls it a baptism IN the Holy Spirit. Says Cyril of Jerusalem, "As he who goes into the water and is baptized (immersed) *is encompassed on all sides by the waters*, so were they completely baptized (immersed) by the Spirit. The water *envelopes* externally; but the Spirit baptizes



(immerses, envelopes) also, and that perfectly, the soul within." This is in accordance with the representations of scripture elsewhere. "I was IN the Spirit." "Ye are IN the Spirit." "If we live IN the Spirit, let us also walk IN the Spirit."

### 3. *The symbolical import of baptism.*

(1.) Baptism is, to the believer, a *sign of his entire separation from sin, and union with Christ*. As it is a sign of this entire change in all its particulars, so it is sometimes put for those several particulars. Thus separation from sin includes a removal of its guilt. Hence Peter says, "Repent and be baptized, for the remission of sins;" i. e., receive the sign of the remission of sins. Hence Ananias says to Saul, "Arise and be baptized and *wash away thy sins*;" i. e., receive the sign of the removal of guilt. Again, separation from sin includes deliverance from its power over the soul, and hence involves repentance; hence John says, "I indeed baptize you in water, into repentance;" i. e., the sign of repentance. But this whole idea of separation from sin and union with Christ, including all its parts, is presented by Paul in Rom. 6: 3, 4. The whole argument of the apostle in this chapter

rests on this great fact, that baptism is a sign of an entire separation from sin. "How shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" If they were true Christians, they were dead to sin; and that they *professed* by having received baptism, the appointed sign of separation from sin, as is shown in the next verse: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death?" To be baptized into Christ is to make a profession of the name of Christ, of the reception of his doctrines, of submission to his authority, and of a complete union with him. Consequently when baptism is properly administered, (and Paul is reasoning here on the supposition that it was, in the case of those whom he addressed,) it implies faith in the subject; and he who is thus baptized, "is baptized into Christ's death." Faith makes him one with Christ, and thus he becomes, as it were, a participant in the death of Christ; as the apostle expresses it, he is "dead with Christ." But faith not only implies a union with Christ in his death, it also implies a union with him in his resurrection. Not only is the believer "dead with Christ," he is also "risen with him." He is thus un-

der most solemn obligation to be dead unto sin, and alive unto God. I need not remind the reader how often these and kindred expressions occur in the apostolic writings.

On these premises is based the conclusion expressed in the next verse: "THEREFORE we are BURIED with him, BY BAPTISM *into* [his] death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of his Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." That is, because faith implies all that is expressed in the preceding verse, THEREFORE God has ordained that believers shall be baptized; and when believers are BURIED BY BAPTISM, they express by that visible act their union with Christ in his death, in his burial, (hence buried *with him*) and in his resurrection; and hence are laid under the strongest possible obligation to "walk in newness of life." The same truth is expressed in Col. 2: 12: "*Buried with him in baptism*, wherein also ye are risen with him, through faith," &c. It is only those who have faith, who are united with Christ in his burial and in his resurrection. And that union with Christ is symbolized in baptism. Those who "through faith are buried in baptism," are "buried WITH CHRIST in

baptism," and "therein also they are risen WITH HIM."

The reader will at once see what conclusion will follow, if I have given a correct view of this text. New Testament baptism cannot be any thing but the immersion of believers. Though it could be demonstrated that *baptizo* has fifty meanings, of which only one represents a burial, the forty-nine ought to be rejected, and the one chosen; for Paul here declares that a BURIAL IS EXPRESSED IN BAPTISM *for the reason that nothing else is an adequate sign of our separation from sin, and our union with Christ.* "THEREFORE WE ARE BURIED WITH HIM IN BAPTISM."

Dr. P. says,—let the "plain" reader mark it—☞ "There is no allusion in these passages to the mode of water baptism!" These "are expressions concerning *spiritual baptism* which have really no bearing on the subject!" "The resurrection spoken of, is plainly spiritual. It is to newness of life. Consequently being buried with Christ must be spiritual." (p. 110.) Again, on p. 111, he says on Col. 2: 12, "The person plunged in water *rises* by the muscular strength of the man who plunges him, or at least by physical power. But Paul

says, 'Ye are risen with him through faith.' ” All this is true. I have expressly stated that the union with Christ in his death, burial and resurrection is by faith. But that is not all the truth. Paul says that it is not only by faith, but it is also “by baptism” and “in baptism,” that we are buried and risen with Christ. And what can that mean except that baptism symbolizes this union with Christ? When Annanias says to Saul, “Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins,” will Dr. P. claim that water baptism cannot be meant here, because water baptism cannot wash away sins, and therefore he must mean spiritual baptism? When Peter says, “Repent and be baptized, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins,” will he claim that because water baptism cannot be a ground of remission of sins, therefore Peter meant spiritual baptism? Every reader must see that there are just as good grounds for denying water baptism in these passages, as in the one under consideration. And they are to be taken in the same way, viz: as speaking of baptism as a *symbol* of the facts and truths mentioned. If I were a Quaker, I could wish no better ground to plant myself on, to prove

that no water baptism is required in the New Testament, after the resurrection of Christ, than Dr. P. gives me on this passage.

The following expression is calculated to awaken some surprise in the mind of "*industrious ignorance.*" "*Most Baptist writers insist on it that these passages have reference to the mode of water baptism!*" The "plain" reader undoubtedly infers from this that nobody but Baptists ever dreamed of so wild an interpretation! As a piece of information which I conceive he is entitled to have, I will just remark that of all the fathers, Greek and Latin, all the Catholic interpreters, all the reformers, all the Genevan, and Dutch, and German theologians, all the German commentators and critics, all the English and Scotch theologians and commentators, and all American commentators, not more than three or four can be found who do not agree that these passages refer to "the mode of water baptism." I do not believe that more than two can be found; but to be "within bounds," I will say three or four. "Most Baptist writers" indeed!\*

---

\* Of course the reader will not understand me as including under the head of "commentators," controversial writers

After saying that "most Baptist writers insist &c.," he adds, "There are some exceptions to this statement. Dr. Judson, the Baptist missionary, and Robinson, the Baptist historian, both admit that these passages are misapplied when used as evidence of the mode of baptism." On what authority Dr. P. makes this statement in relation to Robinson, he does not inform us. He certainly could not have made it on the authority of a personal examination of his work. After a careful examination of his "History of Baptism," I feel safe in affirming that there is nothing in that work which furnishes a foundation for his statement. Robinson refers to that passage in Romans several times, and always as proving immersion to be the scriptural and apostolical baptism. As a specimen of the manner in which he refers to it, I quote the following from p. 76. He is here giving an extract from a homily of Basil, in which the following occurs: "It is necessary to the perfection of

---

on baptism. I mean writers whose direct object was the exposition of the scriptures; as Scott, Doddridge, Henry, Clark, Gill, Macknight, Stuart, &c. I will only add that I have not made the declaration above without *particular inquiry*.

a Christian life that we should imitate Christ, not only in his life, but also in his death. How can we be placed in a likeness to his death? By being *buried with him in baptism*. How are we to go down with him into the grave? By imitating the *burial* of Christ in *baptism*; for the bodies of the baptized are, in a sense, *buried in water*. The water exhibits an image of death, *receiving the body as into a sepulchre*; the spirit renews the soul, and we rise from a death of sin into a newness of life. By three *immersions* therefore, and by three invocations, we administer the ceremony of baptism.”

Mr. Robinson adds: “A translation of the Lent homilies of the ancient Greek bishops could not be read to any congregation of modern Christians without great absurdity, except to Baptist assemblies, and there they would be heard in raptures, for their SINGULAR PROPRIETY AND BEAUTY.”

I do not happen to possess Dr. Judson’s sermon on baptism, though I read it several years since, and remember nothing like what Dr. P. has stated. I will leave it for the reader to judge how far he is entitled to credit in this naked statement, without quoting a word to prove it, or referring us to any book



or page, especially after it is so clear that he has misstated the fact in relation to Robinson, and as that too, is not a solitary case of misstatement.

(2.) Baptism is a symbol of *the burial and resurrection of Christ*. This is evident from the passages already considered, Rom. 6: 4, 5, Col. 2: 12. Baptism could not be a symbol of the union of the believer with Christ in his burial and resurrection, if it were not also a symbol of the burial and resurrection of Christ. How expressive immersion is as a symbol of these great facts—how utterly unmeaning sprinkling is in this point of view, every person must see. Bishop Hoadly well observes, “If baptism had been performed by the apostles, as it now is amongst us, we should never have so much as heard of this form of expression, of dying and rising again in this rite.”

As a specimen simply of the manner in which different writers, both ancient and modern, speak of these passages, in contrast with the remarks of Dr. P., I will quote two or three. I might fill a volume with similar citations.

Chrysostom says, “The symbol of baptism

refers at the same time to burial and death, and to resurrection and life. For our heads being immersed in the water, as in a sepulchre, the old man is buried, and sinking down, the whole is concealed at once; then as we emerge, the new man rises again."

Cyril. "As Jesus, taking the sins of the whole world, died, that, having put to death sin, he might raise thee up in righteousness; so thou also descending into the water and being in a manner buried as he was in the rock, art raised again, walking in newness of life."

The expression of Doddridge is quite remarkable. We are not to suppose that that great and good man was possessed of the gift of prophecy; but had he in the exercise of such a power foreseen the issuing of some late Pedo-baptist books on baptism, could he have expressed himself more to the purpose than he does in the following: "It seems the part of CANDOR to confess that here is an allusion to the *manner of baptizing* by IMMERSION as most usual in those early times." I leave the reader to make his own reflections.

The great Chalmers whose praise is in every body's mouth, expresses himself as follows: "Jesus Christ by death underwent

this sort of baptism,—even immersion under the surface of the ground, whence he soon emerged again by his resurrection. We, by being baptized into his death, are conceived to have made a similar translation; in the act of descending under the water of baptism, to have resigned an old life, and in the act of ascending, to emerge into a second, or new life.”

My next quotation shall be from the last writer on the subject, Dr. P., p. 110. “Dead bodies are not *plunged* into the earth”! How many steps are there from the sublime to the ridiculous! “Nor is the mode of burying the dead alike among all nations.” No; but it is reserved for Dr. Peters, of all men in the world, to find any nation that buries the dead by *sprinkling*. “Christ was not *buried*;” so Dr. Peters—Paul says he *was* buried; (1 Cor. 15: 4,) so says Christ himself; (Mat. 26: 12,) “but laid in a tomb hewn out of a rock, probably above ground.” So Dr. Peters; Christ says he was “three days and three nights in the *heart of the earth*.” Is not the reader almost ready to “turn away from this scene of human error and confusion”?

After these miserable cavils, unworthy the name and reputation of ABSALOM PETERS,

need I say to "plain men," that the body of Christ was surrounded, covered, with the substance of which his sepulchre was composed, whence Chalmers, with perfect propriety of language, calls his burial an *immersion*; and so in the rite of baptism, the subject is surrounded, covered, with the baptismal water, whence it is, with great beauty and force, called a *burial*. Need the reader be also reminded that the comparison in the passages under consideration is not with "burning the bodies" of the dead, nor with "hanging them up till the flesh decays," but *specifically with the burial of Christ*.

But we must have one more quotation from Dr. P., (p. 112.) "Christian baptism is a symbol of moral purity, of being cleansed from sin, and renovated by the influences of the Holy Spirit. It signifies that we are both dead and risen at the same time; dead to sin, but alive to holiness." I could scarcely express my own view with more force and clearness than Dr. P. has done it here for me. If Dr. P. will stand by this declaration, he must agree with me on this passage. He cannot avoid it. If Christian baptism signifies that we are *both dead and risen* at the same time,

may it not signify that we are both *buried and risen* at the same time? Without insisting on the fact that the expression of the apostle is “BURIED and risen,” instead of *dead and risen*, does not the expression *dead and risen* imply burial? and has not Dr. P. conceded the whole argument? As to what is said of “dead men’s bones” and “natural corruption,” if it has any force, it applies against himself, and not against us. He says that baptism signifies that we are “DEAD and risen.” But being *dead* certainly suggests the idea of “physical decomposition, and natural corruption, and dead men’s bones.” But *we* say it signifies *being buried and risen*:—the burial having an allusion specifically to the burial of Christ, who was laid in a “new tomb, wherein never man was laid,” and where consequently there were no “dead men’s bones;” and he, it is said, “saw no corruption.” The only way therefore for Dr. P. to escape from himself, is to say “Christian baptism signifies that we are both *buried and risen*,” instead of “*dead and risen*;” bearing in mind that burial implies death. I should then have no controversy with him about this passage.

The reader, I trust, will now see that these

passages (Rom. 6: 4, 5, Col. 2: 12,) contain express reference to the ordinance of Christian baptism. If he sees this, he cannot fail of seeing that the following inferences necessarily follow.

1. Baptism in the time of Paul was *universally* immersion. "SO MANY OF US AS WERE BAPTIZED," &c. "Therefore WE are BURIED with him BY BAPTISM." It is positively universal. It admits no exceptions.

2. The subjects of baptism at that time were ALWAYS presumed to be BELIEVERS. "SO MANY OF US as were baptized INTO JESUS CHRIST, were baptized INTO HIS DEATH." "Like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of his Father, we also should walk in newness of life." "Buried WITH HIM in baptism wherein YE ARE ALSO RISEN WITH HIM THROUGH FAITH."

(3.) Baptism is a symbol *of the resurrection and glorification of the believer.*

Inasmuch as the resurrection of Christ is the assurance and pledge of the resurrection of all his followers, whatever is a symbol of the first, is to a like extent a symbol of the last. Dr. Macknight\* judges,—I think with

---

\* A Presbyterian.

good reason—that the resurrection of believers is included in those expressions of Paul in Rom. 6, “walk in newness of life”—“being planted in the likeness of his resurrection.”

The passage in 1 Cor. 15: 29, is quoted on p. 108,\* with an exposition from Dr. Schmucker, referring it to an early custom of vicarious baptism, of the existence of which in apostolic times, the New Testament gives us no intimation. Dr. P. thinks its signification somewhat obscure. He would translate *huper* (for) *over*, which is its more usual signification. Still *for*,

---

\* Prof. Robinson rejects entirely the notions advanced by Dr. Peters on this passage, as unfounded and absurd. He gives two modes of explanation of the passage, both of which he says “are natural, and give an easy and satisfactory sense. The one sets out from the literal, and perhaps original meaning of *baptizo*, to *immerse*, *immerge*, i. e., so as to be entirely immersed, or sunk in any thing; as to be immersed in calamities. The argument then is, ‘If the dead rise not at all, of what avail is it to expose ourselves to so many dangers and calamities, in the hope of a resurrection, and a future reward? in the hope that we shall rise again, and enter into rest? Since if the supposition be true, we are *dead*, and are never to rise.’” The other method of explanation which he gives, is the one I have given above and which I incline to adopt. He says this view is adopted by Neander and Wetstein; Barnes also adopts it. The reader will see that whichever of these we take as the true explanation, it is a clear proof that *baptizo*, in the New Testament, means to *immerse*, or *overwhelm*.

or *in behalf of*, is not an unusual signification of it, with the genitive. The declaration will then be, that baptism is *in behalf of* the dead. Whenever a person is baptized, he presents in symbol the resurrection of Christ, and with it the resurrection of all who are by faith united with Christ in his burial and resurrection. It is thus a most beautiful ordinance; pointing the believer to most precious truth. Am I sorrowing for dear friends who "have fallen asleep," and who, unbelief would say, have "perished"? I see in this most significant ordinance a symbol and pledge of their glorious resurrection. Instituted by Christ for this purpose, every time I administer, or witness it, I have in effect a fresh assurance from the Saviour himself of the precious reality of this truth.

I have no doubt that this is the import of the passage in 1 Pet. 3: 21, quoted by Dr. P., p. 66. I will quote this from the translation and paraphrase of Macknight. "To which water, the antitype baptism now saveth us also—*gives us the assurance that we shall be saved out of the grave*—through the resurrection of Jesus Christ, *emblematically represented in baptism.*" He calls baptism the antitype of



the waters of the flood, in opposition, as the reader will see, to the view of Dr. P. His reason is that the relative pronoun agrees in gender with the noun rendered *water*, but does not with *ark*; water, therefore, must be its antecedent. From his note I extract the following: "The water of baptism is here called the *antitype to the water of the flood*, because the flood was a type of baptism in the following particulars: 1. As by building the ark and by entering into it Noah showed a strong faith in the promise of God, concerning his preservation by the very water which was to destroy the antediluvians, so by giving ourselves *to be buried in the water of baptism*, we show a like faith in God's promise, that though we die and are buried, he will save us from death, by raising us up from the dead at the last day. 2. As the preserving of Noah alive, during the nine months he was *in the flood*, is an emblem of the preservation of the souls of believers while in the state of the dead, so the preserving of believers alive while buried in the water of baptism, is a pre-figuration of the same event."

If this exposition of this very critical and learned commentator is correct, the reader

will see that the remarks of Dr. P. on p. 66, are quite irrelevant. If, however, here is an allusion to the position of the ark, the proper meaning of baptize is still fully retained. The ark was as truly *immersed* as if it had been submerged in the deep. Beneath it were the waters which bore it up; above and around it was the deluge pouring through the opened windows of heaven. To say that "the ark was *sprinkled* with the rain that fell from heaven," must be a weak conception indeed of the deluge.

I have now shown what is the symbolical import of baptism. I have shown that it is a sign of the believer's union, by faith, with Christ, in his death, burial and resurrection, and consequently of his entire separation from sin; including hence the washing away of sin, or spiritual purification;—that it is also a symbol of the burial and resurrection of Christ, and of the believer's future and glorious resurrection. Not one of these truths can be expressed without representing the burial and resurrection of Christ. And no external rite, involving the application of water, can express these great truths, but immersion. The symbolical import of the or-

dinance decides that baptize, so far as it expresses a physical act, means only *immerse*.

4. *Other figurative allusions to baptism.*

The remaining figurative allusions to baptism are two. The first is expressed in Luke 12: 50, and Mat. 20: 22. "I have a baptism to be baptized with." "Are ye able to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" Dr. P. is wisely silent in regard to these passages; whether *candidly* silent, I leave for the reader to judge. Christ is here speaking of his sufferings; and he calls them a baptism. Now I ask the Christian to take his Bible and first read the prophetic descriptions of the sufferings of Christ in Ps. 22 and 69, Isa. 53, and then read the history of those sufferings in the garden and on the cross; and while you read, and weep, and adore, ask yourself whether the word *sprinkle* describes those sufferings! Dr. P. says the word baptize means *sprinkle* in the New Testament; what does the Savior say it means? No finite being could conceive of his sufferings as he himself could; and of all words in the Greek language, he employs the one which he used when he gave the command to baptize. He did not mean *sprinkle* now; nothing less than

immerse could he mean; what, on the clearest principles of interpretation, could he have meant when he gave the command to baptize? I do not speak disparagingly of the book I am now examining, when I say that myriads of such books would be nothing to me, in comparison with this one expression from the lips of our blessed Lord and Master.

The other figurative allusion to baptism is in 1 Cor. 10: 2, quoted by Dr. P. on p. 63. The Israelites "were all baptized unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea." Dr. P. says "The reference is to Exod. 14: 19, &c., where it is most manifest that water was poured or sprinkled on them from the cloud"! Most manifest! It is fortunate that we all have Bibles. He adds, "Prof. Stuart says—I know not on what authority—'the cloud on this occasion was not a cloud of rain'"! On what authority? Is there a Sabbath scholar in New England that needs to be told that the cloud on this occasion was the cloud of the Divine presence that constantly attended the Israelites—the pillar of cloud by day, and the pillar of fire by night? It is said that on this occasion (as always in the night,) it was light to Israel; how could that

be if rain was falling on them so violently that it might be said, "The clouds poured out water"? The pouring out of water and the dashing of the spray, the creations of Dr. P.'s imagination, would have been a serious hindrance to the Israelites, and are in direct contradiction to the historian, who says they went through on "*dry land.*" But does not Asaph say, "The *clouds* (not *cloud*—the pillar of cloud) poured out water"? Yes; and we have every reason to suppose they did on the Egyptians. They doubtless had blackness, rain, thunder and lightning—every thing that could annoy or terrify them. They were the *sprinkled* party. As for the other showers of rain, referred to by Dr. P., they are not in point, for the baptism in the cloud was at the same time with the baptism in the sea.

It is strange that good men will put God's word to the torture to make it say something which it does not say. *What does Paul say?* "All our fathers were *under* the cloud, and all passed *through* the sea, and were all baptized unto Moses, *in the cloud and in the sea.*" Not in the cloud alone; nor in the sea alone; "in the cloud *and* in the sea;" it required both at once to make a baptism. They "passed

*through* the sea;” hence the sea was on each side of them; they were at the same time “*under* the cloud;” and thus, between them both, - they were completely surrounded or *immersed*. A *sprinkling* or *pouring* here, is totally out of the question. They are said to have been baptized, because in that ordinance the baptismal water *surrounds* the individual immersed. And if immersion were not the meaning of the word baptize, there would be no force in this allusion.

An expression occurs in this connection, (p. 65,) which seems to demand a passing remark. “The Egyptians were truly *immersed*; they were ‘*buried in immersion unto death*,’ as our Baptist brethren are so fond of saying.” Had Dr. P. contented himself with saying, “The Egyptians were truly immersed,” I should have nothing to say. It would be much in the style of my expression, “The Egyptians were the sprinkled party.” But to apply to them that expression of Paul’s, “Buried by baptism unto death,” seems to me to border upon irreverence, if not profaneness. True, he may say the word there is *baptism*, not *immersion*; but what if it should turn out that the word baptism does mean im-

mersion? Then he will be found to have used the very expression. Nay, I think if he admit that there is any reference to outward baptism at all, in that passage, he must admit that it is *immersion*, since it is a *burial*.

I have now shown, I trust to the reader's satisfaction, that the New Testament proves the meaning of baptize to be *immerse*, or *overwhelm*. I have shown it from its use of the word in every situation in the New Testament except the historical relations of baptism; and those will be in due time considered. I will now ask the reader to consider what ground we have gone over, and where we now stand. It has been shown by the testimony of some of the ablest Pedito-baptist philologists, that the word *baptizo* in the classics always means immerse. It has been shown by similar testimony, admitted also by the silence of Dr. P., that the same thing is true of the Septuagint, and the Jewish-Greek writers, down to the writing of the New Testament. I have shown it of the New Testament, excepting of course the passages which describe the administration of baptism, which are the ones whose import we wish to settle. And now I ask, am I not entitled to claim,

that the word baptizo always means to *immerse*? If, in every other case except when it relates to the ordinance of Christian baptism, in the whole range of Greek literature, classical and sacred, it means immerse, can its meaning be any thing else when it relates to that ordinance?

We will now inquire where Dr. P. is.

“ALL QUESTIONS ON THE MODE OF BAPTISM  
REDUCED TO ONE.” (p. 59.)

It would at first sight seem to be a happy circumstance, if all the questions on baptism could be reduced to one. We might hope to settle that one, and so close the controversy. But I fear the one will be found to contain all the rest; so that if all=one, one=all. But what is the ONE question? “Shall the water be *poured* or *sprinkled* on the person, or must the person be *dipped* or *immersed* into the water?” I hope the reader does not suppose we have any new question here. If he consider it a moment, he will see that it is only another form of stating the original question with which Dr. P. started, and which he then called “the true question:” “What is the



meaning of *baptizo*, as used in the New Testament, to designate the ordinance of baptism?" When "the true question" is settled, "the one" will be.

But we will follow Dr. P. into the "one." His position is, "The water must be applied to the person, and not the person to the water."

But how is this position proved? First, by declaring, what surely no one would deny, that in the sprinklings under the law, the water was applied to the subject, and then repeating the old assertion, that Paul called these sprinklings baptism. I have shown that Paul did no such thing. So much for this proof. The second proof, from the baptizing before dinner, and the baptism of cups, pots, brazen vessels and couches, I have considered and proved that all those were immersions. The third proof, under the head of "figurative allusions," has been considered. Omitting for the present the baptism of John, the next proof is the "prophecies intimating the mode of Christian baptism." p. 78. These prophecies are "So shall HE (Christ) sprinkle many nations." "Then will I (God) sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean."

Now perhaps Dr. P. supposed that some of the "plain men" for whom he designed his book, would be taken by such a palpable misapplication of scripture as that; and because the word sprinkle is here used, conclude it must be that Christian baptism is here spoken of. But is it not possible that they may notice that the prophecy describes what CHRIST and GOD would do, not what *ministers* would do? Ministers administer Christian baptism; God and Christ will do the sprinkling referred to. Bishop Hughes never imposed upon Irish Catholics a more palpable perversion of scripture, than the application of those prophecies to Christian baptism.

The next argument is on the baptism of the Holy Ghost. That has been considered.

Such are the arguments which Dr. P. advances to settle the "one" question to which all the rest may be reduced. But is it not apparent to the reader that such a course of reasoning can do nothing towards settling it?

There are two principles on which this question may be settled; and in no other way can it be done. The first is to ascertain the meaning of the word baptize. If it be proved that it means *sprinkle*, then every body allows

that the water must be applied to the subject. In no other way can a sprinkling be performed. If, on the other hand, it means immerse, in administering the rite of baptism, the subject must be applied to, or rather *into* the water. An immersion may be effected by applying the water to the subject; but it could not be in a religious ordinance. And after having proved that *baptizo* uniformly means immerse, in classical Greek, in Jewish Greek, and in the New Testament, (excepting only the passages in question) am I not entitled to affirm, that so far as this principle goes, this "one" question is settled, and it is *proved* that in baptism the subject is applied to the water rather than the water to the subject?

#### CONSTRUCTION OF BAPTIZO.

The other principle which may aid in settling the "one" question is, How is *baptizo* construed? What is its position in the sentence, its relation to the nominative case, to the object, and what prepositions follow it? I hope no "plain" reader will suppose I am putting a case that nobody but Greek scholars can understand. I trust I shall set this point

in a light that shall make it intelligible to the plainest common sense of every reader of the English Bible.

Suppose the word baptize means *pour*; every body sees that we could have no such expressions as these in Greek, or any other language: "I indeed *pour* you in water;" "They were all *poured* of him in Jordan," &c. Every body sees that that is absurd; and that if *baptizo* is the word employed in those passages where I have put *pour*, that word cannot mean pour.

Again, suppose it means *sprinkle*; every body sees that such expressions as the following would never occur: "I indeed *sprinkle* you *in* water;" "They were all *sprinkled* of him *in* Jordan;" "He was *sprinkled* of John *into* Jordan." Nor would it be strictly correct to say, "I sprinkle you *with* water." Custom has indeed sanctioned it. But it is contrary to the proper use of language. The word *sprinkle* means properly, to scatter in drops or small particles, water, blood, ashes, or whatever the substance may be. We should then say, "I sprinkle water *on* you." Water is the immediate object; the person besprinkled is the remote object, following the preposition

on. If we examine the Bible we shall find that this is the more usual construction of the word *sprinkle*.

Again, suppose the word baptize means *immerse*; every body sees that we should have no such expressions as "I baptize water on you." It would be, "I baptize you *in* water;" "They were baptized of him *in* Jordan;" "He was baptized of John *into* Jordan." Every body sees that we could use the word immerse here and make perfect sense, while the words *pour* or *sprinkle* would be nonsense.

Now this is the way the word *baptizo* is always used. *Whenever the word baptizo occurs in a full expression—i. e., when we have the nominative, the verb, the person baptized and the element—the person baptized is the immediate object of the verb, and the element follows the preposition en=in, usually expressed, rarely understood. The preposition eis=into, is sometimes used. Thus, "I baptize you in water."* I have no hesitation in affirming positively this proposition; for I am certain that no person who has any pretensions to Greek scholarship will dispute it. And every reader will see that no English word but immerse can be substituted for baptize in such a sentence. We

cannot say, "I *pour* you in water;" nor "I *sprinkle* you in water;" it must be "I *immerse* you in water."

That profound scholar, Dr. George Campbell, referred to by Dr. P., p. 29, expresses these same sentiments in his note on Mat. 3: 11. I quote from him to show that I am not singular in the statement I have made, and perhaps the fact that Dr. Campbell was a distinguished Presbyterian may add weight to what he says. "The word *baptizo*, both in sacred and classical authors, signifies to *dip*, to *plunge*, to *immerse*, and is *always construed suitably to this meaning*. Thus it is *in water*, *in the Jordan*."

"Ezekiel 36: 25, is in the Septuagint, 'I will sprinkle *upon you* clean water,' and not as *baptizo* is always construed, 'I will sprinkle you *in* clean water.' Had *baptizo* been here (i. e., Mat. 3: 11) employed in the sense of *raino*, *I sprinkle*, (which so far as I know, it *never is in any use*, sacred or classical,) the expression would doubtless have been, 'I indeed baptize *upon you*, water;' agreeably to the examples referred to."

If this principle is correct, (and I do not believe it can be successfully controverted) it

settles, beyond controversy, that the true meaning of *baptizo* is to *immerse*. It settles too Dr. P.'s "one" question, and shows that in baptism the subject must be applied to the water.

And how will Dr. P. escape this conclusion? By claiming that the preposition *en* (in) employed in Mat. 3, and Mark 1, does not mean *in*, (p. 63.) It is true he admits more than we ask. He says that "*into* is the more common meaning of this particle." He is the first man I ever heard admit, or claim, that this particle *ever* means *into*. It almost always means *in*; it is very rarely translated by any other preposition when its meaning *in* does not clearly appear. In every passage which Dr. P. has quoted on p. 68, where *with* occurs, it is *en* and means *in*. "I am come baptizing *in* water." "I indeed baptize you *in* water into repentance; he shall baptize you *in* the Holy Ghost." Dr. P. says, "It would be a plain perversion of the passage to say, 'he shall immerse you *into* the Holy Ghost.'" It would be a *mistranslation*, because it is *in* and not *into*. Prof. Robinson, who has been introduced to the reader as the most celebrated biblical critic in America,

quoted as indisputable authority by Dr. P. on p. 29, does not think it a plain perversion of language to say "He shall baptize you *in* the Holy Ghost;" for so he translates it. Dr. Campbell does not; he translates it "*in* water," and "*in* the Holy Ghost," and administers the following rebuke to those who translate it *with*: "It is to be regretted that we have so much evidence that even good and learned men allow their judgments to be warped by the sentiments and customs of the sect which they prefer. The true partizan, of whatever denomination, always inclines to correct the diction of the Spirit by that of the party." The reflecting reader can think of this; bearing in mind that the learned Doctor is speaking of this specific point—the translation of Mat. 3: 11. The reader can see too, after what I have shown in regard to the baptism of the Holy Ghost, that so far from "He shall *immerse* you *in* the Holy Ghost," being a "plain perversion," it is precisely what the sense requires.


It may aid the unlettered reader, to know that the preposition *en* occurs eight times in Mat. 3. If *baptizo* means *immerse*, it has its natural and proper meaning *in*, in every in-



stance. But how does Dr. P. prove that "the water must be applied to the subject"? When he reads this chapter he gives this preposition its proper meaning till he comes to the sixth verse, where he calls it *at*—then it is *in* again, till he gets to the eleventh verse, and there he calls it *with*—then it is *in* to the close. I will leave it for the candid reader to judge who is guilty of the "plain perversion" of the word of God.

But, as if to hedge the way against any such perversion, Mark is still more explicit. He says, "were all baptized *in* the river of Jordan." Can any thing be clearer? If the Evangelist wished to teach that baptism implies the application of the subject to the water, and not the water to the subject, how could he do it with more explicitness? Again Mark says (1: 9,) that Christ was baptized "*into* the Jordan"—(*eis ton Iordanen*); expressing still more strongly the same idea.

Now let the reader mark—Dr. P. will admit, that the more common meaning of these prepositions is *in* and *into*—indeed no man has the hardihood to deny it. But that is *prima facie* evidence that they have that meaning here. It is a universal rule of interpretation

that every word shall have its proper meaning unless there is clear necessity for changing it. But what is the necessity here?  *The necessity of Dr. P.'s theory of baptism; not a shadow of necessity else.* Let every word in the record have its proper and usual meaning, and baptism is proved to be immersion; and it cannot be made sprinkling without torturing the record. Nay, it is not made then; the torture will not extort it; after all it is naked assumption.

I have now gone over the most essential points in Dr. Peters' first part. I have shown that the meaning of the word baptize, when our Saviour gave that command, was immerse—that was its meaning as settled by uniform usage, in classical, Jewish, and the New Testament Greek. I have shown, both from the meaning of the word, and its uniform construction, that the idea of baptism cannot be the application of water to the subject, rather than the reverse. And here I might stop. After this is shown there cannot be much weight in what remains untouched. Still the reader may desire that some of the dust which the Doctor has thrown around the New Testament accounts of baptism should be

brushed away. And this we will proceed to do, with as much brevity as the case admits. We will first address ourselves to the extraordinary conclusions touching

#### JOHN'S BAPTISM.

In Sect. IV, Dr. P. makes some remarks in reference to the nature and design of John's baptism. He labors at some length to prove that John's baptism was not Christian baptism. And what if it was not? It surely was *baptism*, and Christian baptism is *baptism*; and when we have ascertained what the one was, we have learned all that in our present inquiry relates to the other. John's baptism unquestionably differed in some particulars from that administered by the apostles. Still that the gospel dispensation *opened* with John's ministry, is evident from the following passages: Mark 1: 1. Mat. 11: 12, 13. Luke 16: 16. That the gospel dispensation was not fully set up till after the resurrection of Christ, is equally evident. Still I do not see what bearing that has upon our present inquiry.

Dr. P. makes some singular statements on this point. He says "John's baptism was ad-

ministered on profession of *repentance*; Christian baptism, on profession of *regeneration*.\* This is proved (?) by reference to Acts 2: 38, where Peter says “*Repent and be baptized*”! He says, “As to any *recognition* of the Holy Ghost in John’s baptism, some whom he had baptized, themselves affirmed, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.” I will just refer the reader to Mat. 3: 11, John 1: 32, 33. To account for the ignorance of those disciples in regard to the Holy Ghost, described in Acts 19, we may remark that *it is not said* that John baptized those disciples. They said they were baptized “*unto John’s baptism.*” Their very ignorance furnishes a reason for believing that he did not baptize them; and it is probable

---

\* This distinction of the Doctor’s is a remarkable one for a Calvinistic writer to make. Dr. P. has as good a right to be an Arminian as I have to be a Calvinist, though I suppose he is generally understood to be a Calvinist. Calvinists usually maintain that repentance is one of the first evidences that *regeneration has already taken place*; and that consequently a profession of repentance is a profession of regeneration. So Baptists hold; and they administer baptism on precisely the same principles that John and the apostles did; viz, to those who, by *professing repentance*, give evidence of *having experienced regeneration*.

that it was done by some one of John's disciples.

He says, Paul rebaptized those twelve disciples. That is by no means clear. Some Baptists admit that he did; some Pedo-baptists do not admit that he did. Suppose he did; it will not prove the invalidity of John's baptism. The twelve apostles were baptized by John; we have no account that they were rebaptized. Apollos knew only John's baptism, but Paul did not rebaptize him.

But the most extraordinary representation is as to the *number* baptized by John. (Sect. VI.) "*To be within bounds* (!) respectable and *learned* (!) writers, have supposed that John baptized only one-half the people of Palestine, say three millions" ! "He must then have immersed more than one every two seconds" !

But we are spared the necessity of replying to this, for the supposition "is *perhaps* extravagant." *Perhaps* it is. It seems quite probable that it may be! He contents himself with supposing it to be "only one-twelfth part." That would be 500,000, requiring him to baptize "six every minute" of his ministry !

Now perhaps all this looks very imposing to Dr. Peters' "plain men." But let us scan it a little. 1. Dr. P. himself admits that the expressions "All Jerusalem and Judea, and all the region round about Jordan," no more prove that John baptized one-half, than that he baptized the whole. To which I add, they just as much prove that he baptized the whole, as that he baptized one-twelfth. They only prove that a large number *went out*. 2. If we allow for the aged and infirm, and children, probably not more than one-twelfth part of the population *could* have gone out if they wished to. 3. It is on all hands allowed that the majority of the Jews belonged to the sect of the Pharisees. But the Pharisees, it is expressly said, were not baptized of John. (Luke 7: 30.) The Sadducees also were rejected. (Mat. 3: 7.) 4. John baptized none but professed penitents. 5. Christ made disciples in a greater ratio than John. (John 3: 26. 4: 1.) If John made 500,000, since Christ's ministry was twice as long as his, there could not have been, at the time of Christ's death, less than a *million and a half!* And yet Christ calls them a *little flock!* 6. Every representation in the New Testament, and every con-

sideration, would go to show that but a very small proportion of the Jewish people were even *professed* penitents. It was because they had filled up the iniquities of their fathers by rejecting *both John and Christ*, (Mat. 11: 16, 24,) that wrath came upon them to the uttermost. Ten righteous would have saved Sodom. That proportion would doubtless have saved the Jewish nation. 2000 would probably be a small estimate of the population of Sodom, and ten would be the two hundredth part.  $6,000,000 \div 200 = 30,000$ . That I have no doubt is a large estimate of the number of all of John's, and Christ's, and the apostle's disciples among the Jews up to the destruction of Jerusalem. Of those, John could not have made and baptized more than one-third; say 10,000. John's ministry was a year and a half instead of nine months. This I could prove if it were necessary. I shall, however, content myself with saying that every writer that I have seen, except Dr. Peters, makes it not less than that. Deducting the Sabbaths, and we have 470 working days.  $10,000 \div 470 = 22$ ; a very easy day's work, as most Baptist ministers can testify.

Now I do not wish the reader to understand

me as affirming that John did not baptize more than 10,000. I do affirm, however, that it is as easy to prove that he baptized less than that, as it is to prove that he baptized more.

The truth is, all such estimates are idle. The historian *says that John did immerse*. He employs a word that uniformly meant immerse when the history was written. He says that his baptism was "*in water,*" "*in the Jordan,*" "*in the river of Jordan.*" He baptized in Enon near to Salim *because* there was much water there.

But Dr. P. says there is no intimation in scripture that John was at Enon for the convenience of baptizing! A bold assertion truly. What is the declaration? "*John also was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, BECAUSE there was much water there.*" *Because* has reference to *baptizing* and *nothing else* that is mentioned. But he says there was *more* water in the Jordan; why did he not stay there? Well, that is a question of his own asking. The historian gives no reason. If it were my business to conjecture, I should say, because Christ was baptizing in Judea, and as it was not necessary that two such preachers should be so near, John went farther north. But



that is nothing here nor there. I take the history as it stands. That says John was *baptizing* there *because* there was much water there. Bloomfield, Doddridge, and a dozen other Pede-baptist commentators that might be named, assign this as the special reason.

But Dr. P. says he went there because it furnished "accommodations" for the "*encampment* of the thousands and tens of thousands that attended on his ministry." What intimation is there of all this? Great multitudes followed Christ; but they never *encamped*; he always "sent them away" the same day they came. So Dr. P. finds camels, horses, asses—but where? It must be in his imagination. The multitudes that followed Christ "*ran afoot.*" Again, "he was attended by the greatest multitude that ever assembled around a human being for instruction." We have no means of determining how great the multitude was that attended him at Enon; but we find his disciples complaining that *all men* were then following Christ (verse 26). It would seem that the multitude must then have been comparatively small. Then it was "*many streams,*" instead of "*much water.*"

Well, be it so. It is true the Doctor is opposed here by almost all of his own commentators. But it is of little importance. I have no doubt that either of them were large enough to immerse in. The simple declaration of the historian, that John was *baptizing* there *because* there was much water there, is good against all the fanciful conjectures that can be named. The history gives us no account of camels, horses, asses, or *camp meetings*.

It seems to have occurred to Dr. P., that possibly the "plain" reader would perceive that if John sprinkled 3,000,000, or 500,000, in the way it is ordinarily done by Congregational ministers, it would be as impossible for him to sprinkle so many, as it would be to immerse them. He concludes, therefore, that John (and also the apostles on the day of Pentecost) "took a bunch of hyssop, and made it sufficiently large for his purpose, and dipped it in water, and sprinkled the people as they came to him in large numbers at a time"! If the reader has a tolerably active imagination, he can conceive what sort of an exhibition this would be. And to help his imagination, I will relate the following fact, which may be relied

on as perfectly authentic. Some years since, several young and devoted Congregational ministers went to a foreign station as missionaries. God blessed their labors to such a degree that it became necessary for them to baptize several hundred converts at one time; so many that *sprinkling* them one by one would be quite "inconvenient." Taking their cue, therefore, from such books on baptism as the one we are now reviewing, they, on the appointed day, arranged their converts "in ranks," and with a *white-wash brush* for a "bunch of hyssop," sprinkled them "in large numbers at a time." Feeling some misgivings afterwards, they wrote a letter to the Professors of the Theological school where they graduated, in relation to it. The Professors, as was their custom with missionary correspondence, read the letter to the students then in the seminary, and took the opportunity to charge those students, *never, in any circumstances, to be guilty of such a perversion of Christ's ordinances.*

These young missionaries must have been stupid indeed, to suppose that these books on baptism are written for theological students or ministers, or with any expectation that the

“bunch of hyssop” would ever be put in practice. They were written for “plain men” with no practical design, except to keep converts from uniting with the Baptists. The “bunch of hyssop” will doubtless prove very effectual for this purpose.

#### THE BAPTISM OF CHRIST.

Dr. Peters, (pp. 57, 93,) reiterates the old Pede-baptist hypothesis that Christ was baptized as an induction into his priestly office, according to the law of Moses in Ex. 29: 4. Num. 8: 7. But he admits that these washings and sprinklings were “purification.” Paul speaks of them as “purifying of *the flesh* ;” and hence calls them “*carnal*,” that is *fleshly* “ordinances.” (Heb. 9: 10, 13.) Hence he says that the Levitical priests were made “after the law of a *carnal* commandment ;” i. e., a law which required a *carnal* or *fleshly* purification. But Christ, he says, was a priest, “not after the order of Aaron,” but “after the order of Melchisedek ;” that “the priesthood *being changed*, there is of necessity a *change also of the law* ; that “Christ sprang out of Judah, of which tribe *Moses*

*spoke nothing concerning priesthood.*" It must therefore follow that what Moses spoke concerning the consecration of Levitical priests, could have no application to Christ. "And this," says Paul, "is far more evident; for that after the similitude of Melchisedek there ariseth another priest, who is made, NOT AFTER THE LAW OF A CARNAL COMMANDMENT, but after the power of an endless life." (Heb. 7: 11, 16.) But after Paul has said this, Dr. Peters persists in saying that Christ *was* made a priest, *after the law of the carnal commandment*, in Ex. 29: 4, Num. 8: 7!

But Dr. Peters says Christ exercised the office of priest during his personal ministry, and in that character purged the temple. But Paul says "Christ came a high priest of *good things to come*, by a tabernacle *not made with hands*;" (Heb. 9: 11,) and that "if he were on earth he should not be a priest;" as Doddridge expresses it, "he could not, in any consistence with the Jewish institutions, have been a priest *to officiate at the temple of God in Jerusalem.*" Now I leave it for "plain men" to judge, whether Dr. Peters' and Mr. Hibbard's *conjecture* of what Christ *would have said*, if the Jews had said something which

they *did not say*, ought to weigh against these explicit declarations of Paul. I take it the authority on which Christ did the act referred to, was his being the Son of God, i. e., the Messiah; and that he intimates as much when he says, "Make not MY FATHER'S house a house of merchandize;" and that he designed to show to those priests that their authority, founded on the law of *the carnal commandment* in Ex. 29: 4, was fast giving way to the POWER OF AN ENDLESS LIFE.

But at all events, Christ was not immersed! Who says he was not? R. W. Landis in "Kabbah Taken"! On what evidence? Why, at this day, Jewish pilgrims kneeling in the Jordan sprinkle themselves! The question is settled. Let no man hereafter say that Christ was immersed!

But the preposition *apo*, translated *out of*, does not necessarily mean more than *from*. That is freely admitted. But still it does not exclude the idea of *out of*. The preposition *from* in English does not mean *out of*, but still it may be used instead of *out of*. The account states that John baptized Jesus *into* the Jordan; and when he was baptized he *came up* straightway *from* the water. Could he have been bap-

tized *into* the Jordan, and *come up from* the water, without having been *in* the water? Suppose I were to say, "On my return *from* Pittsfield, I called on a friend; and after I had dined, I went immediately *from* his house to my home;" would any body attempt to prove that I was not *in* Pittsfield, and that I did not enter my friend's house? Do you say that the circumstance of dining proves that I was *in* the house? I answer, the fact of Jesus being baptized *into* the Jordan, proves that he was *in* the water.

Dr. Whitby, a well known Pedo-baptist commentator says, "A doubt whether John *immersed* Jesus, *must arise from ignorance.*"

#### BAPTISM OF THE THREE THOUSAND.

Dr. Peters has restated and magnified the difficulties usually urged by Pedo-baptist writers, in the way of immersing the 3000 on the day of Pentecost. Two and a half pages are devoted to showing that there was no water for their immersion! Dr. Gill answered this objection in his day. Every Pedo-baptist writer since then has brought it up again, and every Baptist writer has answered it. But

Dr. P. brings it up without taking the least notice of those answers, and as if it were not only unanswered, but unanswerable. Now let me remind the reader that the 3000 might have been immersed without going out of the temple. There were ten brass lavers, each containing over nine barrels of water, and the great brazen sea, that contained over five hundred barrels of water. But Dr. P. says, "The implacable opposition of the priests and of the Jews in general, must have prevented their using them." The historian, however, intimates no such thing. He says, (Acts 2: 46, 47,) "*They continued daily, with one accord, in the temple, praising God, and having favor with all the people.*" It does not appear from this that their movements were at all interfered with, or interrupted, at this time, by priest or people.

It is carrying controversy a little too far, to urge this objection about want of water, after the publication of Prof. Robinson's book on Palestine. Jerusalem abounded in cisterns, reservoirs, fountains and pools. Prof. Robinson devotes nineteen pages to a description of the abundant means of supplying Jerusalem with water.



But this difficulty surmounted, a greater remains. There were only *eleven* administrators; for "only ten days had intervened since the apostles had received their own commission from the Saviour, and we have no account of their having ordained any person during that time"! Have we not a very circumstantial account of the ordination of Matthias? Then "after the close of Peter's sermon, there were only five hours of the day remaining." How long does he suppose Peter preached? It was only nine o'clock in the morning, after he began to preach. (Acts 2: 15.) One hour, I apprehend, would be a large estimate of the time of his sermon, and that will leave eight hours for the baptism. In that case, the apostles would only have to baptize less than thirty-two every hour. Besides, if they had to baptize "fifty every hour, and five every six minutes," that would not have been "impossible." That has often been done, by Baptist ministers in America. But how does Dr. P. know that the seventy "took no part in the services"? There were one hundred and twenty disciples there, as we are expressly informed, who took part in the ordination of Matthias; why may they not all

have taken part in this baptism? Is baptism any more a peculiarly ministerial work, than ordination? If the seventy took part in this baptism, there would have been less than forty persons for each minister.

It might be instructive to the reader to mention in this connection some things which have been done in the way of baptizing. The following facts are related by Pres. Sears, in the *Christian Review*, vol. 3, p. 91, where the historical authorities are stated.

On the great Sabbath of the Easter festival, April 16, 404, Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople, with the assistance of the clergy of his own church, baptized 3000 catechumens. And he *immersed* them; for Chrysostom, who in innumerable instances in thirteen folio volumes speaks of baptism, never alludes to it as a sprinkling, but on the contrary, defines it to be "a plunging into the water, and a raising out of it;" and says that "we enter into water as into a grave," and that "the whole man is concealed by the immersion."

In 496, according to several French historians, (one of them the successor of Remigius,) Remigius, Bishop of Rheims, assisted by his Presbyters, baptized in one day, Clo-

vis, the French king, and 3000 of his subjects. As to the mode, the historians say that the "Bishop raised the king out of the water."

Otho, the apostle of the Pomeranians, in a short stay at one place, baptized 7000 of the Pomeranians. And the account renders it more than probable that they were all baptized in two days. It is related by an eye witness, who describes minutely the construction of the baptisteries used, calling them "great vats sunk into the earth," and says expressly that the ordinance was administered by a "trine immersion"—"*trina immersione.*"

These facts are sufficient to settle the possibility of immersing the 3000 on the day of Pentecost.

#### BAPTISM OF THE EUNUCH.

Dr. P. in his remarks on this account, descends to the usual trifling of Pedit-baptist controversialists, by affirming that if the expressions "They went down both *into* the water, both Philip and the Eunuch—they were come up *out of* the water," prove that the Eunuch was immersed, they prove also that Philip was immersed. Now if he or any body else supposes that Baptists claim these ex-

pressions as describing the baptism, I beg leave to inform them better. We claim no such thing. First they came *to* a certain water; then they both *went down into* the water; then Philip baptized the Eunuch; then they *came up out of* the water. And we say there is no reason in the world why they should both go down into the water, for the purpose of sprinkling, which might have been done better on the bank, or even without alighting from the chariot. Dr. Doddridge, with his usual candor and good sense, expresses himself on this verse as we should expect a *candid* Pedo-baptist would. He says, “Considering how frequently bathing was used in those hot countries, it is not to be wondered that baptism was *generally* administered by immersion, though I see no proof that it was essential to the institution. It would be very unnatural to suppose that they went down to the water, merely that Philip might take up a little water in his hand to *pour on* the Eunuch. A person of his dignity had, no doubt, many vessels in his baggage, on such a journey through so desert a country, a precaution *absolutely necessary* for travellers in those parts, and *never omitted* by them.”

The account of this baptism, by the inspired historian, is so plain and circumstantial, that all comment seems superfluous. Let the reader mark that the Eunuch says nothing about being baptized till they come to water. But if sprinkling had been in his mind, we may be certain, from our knowledge of the customs of travellers in the east, in all ages, (as referred to by Dr. Doddridge,) that he had water enough in his chariot for that. When they come to the water, the Eunuch does not send one of his retinue to bring water to them; he commands them to stop the chariot, and they both alight. They not only go *to* the water, where they might have stopped if sprinkling was all; they go down *into* the water. Again, the historian is careful to tell us twice over that they *both* went down. If he only said that *one* of them went, there might be some plausibility in the assertion that the Eunuch was not immersed; why should *both* go down into the water, for a sprinkling? Then after the baptism they came up *out of* the water; could they come *out of* the water, if they had not been *in* it? Now whether the water was "*little*" or much, there was enough for *both* to go down into it, and for the Eunuch to be

baptized in it. And what ought any man's fancies and conjectures to weigh against an inspired narrative so explicit?

But the prepositions *eis* and *ek* only mean *to* and *from*. What must the unlettered reader think of the Bible, if words can be made to mean just what the exigencies of every man's religious system demand? I would say, in all kindness to my Pede-baptist brethren in the ministry, use your knife a little more sparingly when you are dealing with God's word. There are some other doctrines besides baptism that we wish to defend and enforce. When Dr. Peters wishes to preach on future punishment, he will need to prove that the wicked will be cast *into* hell, *into* the fire that shall never be quenched; *into* everlasting fire—*into* everlasting punishment, and not merely *to* hell, *to* everlasting fire. But he cannot. In attempting to destroy our weapons, he has destroyed his own. He has wrested *into* out of this passage; but is that all? No; he has wrested it out of all the passages of the class that I have mentioned. Their construction is precisely the same. Every philological reason for saying [that *eis* means *into* in these passages, proves that it means *into* in the passage under

consideration. Wrestling God's word is serious business, whether it is done by good men or by bad men.

But does not *eis* mean *to*, sometimes? Yes, sometimes; but rarely in comparison with the times when it means *into*. And the construction will always determine. And I speak *what I know*, when I say, if the construction does not prove that it means *into* here, it cannot be proved in any case in the New Testament. But though *eis* may mean *to* in some cases, *ek* never means less than *out of*. Dr. P. has given no instance of its meaning *from*, and I hesitate not to say he cannot.\*

In all my reading of controversial writings, I do not remember to have met with a more palpable example of a writer's throwing dust to blind the eyes of his reader, and keep him from discerning the real point at issue, than the Doctor's discussion of the meaning of the prepositions here employed. He cites from examples of the use of *eis* where it may be rendered *to*. But how does he prove that *ek* means *from*? He quotes Dr. Carson as ad-

---

\* It is worthy of remark, that Doddridge, while he translates *eis* in this verse *to*, renders *ek*, *out of*. A clear confirmation of what I have said above.

mitting that “the proper translation of *apo* is *from*.” Does proving that *apo* means *from*, prove that *ek* means *from*? Why did he, when he professed to be discussing the meaning of *ek* in Acts 8: 39, take a sudden turn to Mat. 3: 16, where not *ek* but *apo* is used, if not to blind the eyes of the “plain men for whom his work was designed”? Let me repeat to these “plain men,” that he has not produced a single example in which *ek* means *from*, and he cannot. Though *eis* may, in comparatively few instances, mean *to*, (exceptions to its usual meaning, which its construction invariably shows,) *ek* never means less than *out of*. And the use of *ek* here is a plain proof that *eis*, in this place, means *into*. They could not have come *up out of* the water, without first having gone *into* it.

As further proof that in the 38th verse *eis* means *into* instead of *to*, I will observe that in the 36th verse, “As they went on their way, they came *unto* a certain water,”—where the sense obviously requires *unto*, or *to*, the preposition is not *eis*, but *epi*. This is the preposition which properly means *to*. When the historian clearly and obviously meant *to*, he used *epi*. If he intended to tell us that Philip



and the Eunuch only went *to* the water, (in the 38th verse,) why did he not use *epi* as he did in the 36th verse? Or, on the other hand, if he intended to have us understand him as meaning only *to* when he used *eis* in the 38th verse, why did he not use *eis* in the 36th verse, where the sense obviously requires *to*? Perhaps as Dr. Peters is a "learned man," he can answer these questions; I cannot, on any other supposition than that one of these prepositions means *to*, and the other *into*. According to him, Greek prepositions are a perfect chaos, and mean any thing or nothing, just as the translator chooses. I challenge any man to produce from the whole range of Greek literature, a passage where prepositions are used with more perfect accuracy of meaning, than they are in this passage.

Dr. P., referring to the 26th verse, says the place where Philip and the Eunuch were travelling was a desert, where there could have been no stream in which the Eunuch might have been immersed. It is not necessary for me to prove that there was a stream, in order to prove that he was immersed. If the history does not inform us that he was immersed, no language can do it. But I will inform the

reader, that such biblical scholars as Horne, Hug, and Robinson, one an Englishman, another a German, and the third an American, all preëminent in this department, and all Pedo-baptists, refer the word *desert*, in the 26th verse, not to the country through which they were travelling, but to the city of *Gaza*.

I quote the following from Horne's Introduction, Vol. II, p. 425, and will also refer the reader to Robinson's Lexicon, under the word *Gaza*. "The city of Gaza is mentioned in Acts 8: 26, with the parenthetical remark, that *it (or the same) is desert*, which has greatly exercised the ingenuity of commentators. A passage, however, in Josephus, which has escaped the researches of most of the learned men, clears up the difficulty, and shows the minute fidelity of the sacred historian. A short time before the siege of Jerusalem, in consequence of a massacre of the Jews at Cesarea, the whole nation became greatly enraged, and in revenge, laid waste many villages and cities; and among these were *Gaza*, which they *utterly demolished*. Gaza was therefore actually a *desert* at the time St. Luke wrote." The reader will see that the words "which is desert" are a parenthesis, referring

not to the *way*, but to the state of the city at the time Luke wrote.

There is another fact that I will inform the reader of. Gaza was about sixty miles from Jerusalem. Prof. Robinson lays down on his map four considerable streams running into the Mediterranean sea between those two cities. The route which Messrs. Robinson and Smith travelled between these cities, crosses these streams and their branches, not less than *fifteen times*.  $60 \div 15 = 4$ , giving us a stream large enough to be laid down on a map of the country, to be crossed on an average of *once in four miles* through the whole distance. The Roman road, which probably the Eunuch followed, crosses these streams ten times, an average of once in six miles. A desert country and no water!

To make out that this was a desert country, destitute of water, the Doctor refers us to the sojourn of Abraham and Isaac there. The reader, if he will consult Gen. 26, will find that Isaac went into this country to escape a famine that was raging elsewhere. Would he have gone into a desert with his flocks and herds to escape a famine? Besides, we are told that Isaac sowed in that land, and re-

ceived the same year an hundred fold; that he waxed great—became very great, and had possession of flocks and possession of herds, and a great store of servants; and the Philistines envied him. (Gen. 26: 12—14.) That must have been a desert country indeed! He says, “It was not far from this place that Philip baptized the Eunuch; and the water was probably one of those ‘springs in the desert’ of which we read, (Gen. 26: 19.)” “Of which *we* read”! Perhaps *Dr. Peters* reads of a desert in that verse; but *we* read of no such thing. In the English Bible we read, “And Isaac’s servants digged in the VALLEY, and found there a well of springing water.” If we turn to the Hebrew Bible, we find the word for *valley*, *nachal*, which is thus defined in Robinson’s Gesenius: “A VALLEY with a brook or torrent, a low place with water, Gen. 26: 19.” Dr. Peters is a “learned” man writing for “plain men. “Industrious ignorance” must feel vastly indebted to him.

One other fact I will remind the reader of. Philip, after the baptism, was first found at Azotus. We have then a right to believe that the baptism took place nearer that city than any other. Dr. Robinson lays down on his

map two considerable rivers a few miles from that city, one to the north and the other to the south, and the Roman road crosses both of them. "The presumption, then, that there was a river in the desert, in which the Eunuch might have been immersed, is all a fancy"! (p. 97.)

Dr. Peters tells us on p. 95, what it was which led the Eunuch to think of being "sprinkled" at that time. It was because he had just read the prophecy in Isa. 42: 15, "So shall he sprinkle many nations," which Philip had doubtless explained to him as meaning baptism! Is it not enough for men to pervert God's word themselves, without *conjecturing* that inspired men perverted it? In the 32d verse it is said, "The place of the scripture which he read was this;" and then follows the quotation of Isa. 53: 7, 8, following, says Bloomfield, "the Septuagint version exactly; the verbal discrepancies which occur, not being found in the Alexandrian and other good MSS. of the Septuagint." The Eunuch then was reading from the Septuagint. Now in this version the word *sprinkle* does not occur in Isa. 52: 15. It is "*So shall many nations wonder, or admire because of him.*" So even

this absurd conjecture is utterly destitute of foundation.

#### PAUL'S BAPTISM.

Dr. P. tells us that Paul was baptized out of a "water pot of stone," which stood in the house where he had been three days fasting! If Paul himself had said that he was immersed, would Dr. Peters believe it? Paul did say he was immersed. "Know ye not that *so many* of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore WE are BURIED with him by *baptism*." Buried in a water pot of stone!

#### BAPTISM OF CORNELIUS AND HIS FRIENDS.

Dr. Peters thinks Peter's question, "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized?" means "Will some one be kind enough to bring in some water, that these may be baptized"! If this were the meaning, should we not expect the remainder of the verse would read, "And he commanded a servant to bring in a water pot of stone"? Peter's question plainly means, Can any man forbid *baptism* to these persons? This is

shown by what follows, "And he commanded them *to be baptized.*"

#### BAPTISM OF LYDIA AND HER HOUSEHOLD.

Dr. P. thinks it improbable that Lydia and her household were immersed, because we are not told whether she changed her raiment or not. As I do not wish to be wise above what is written, I will not undertake to say. On the express declaration of the record, I affirm they were *immersed*. The word baptize we have seen always means immerse; is it reasonable to suppose that it means any thing else here? Besides, they were not by a "water pot of stone," but by a river side; a good place for immersion.

#### BAPTISM OF THE JAILER AND HIS HOUSEHOLD.

Dr. P. says the jailer and his household were baptized in the prison: the historian says the contrary. Verse 30 tells us the jailer "*brought them out;*" out of what? They were in the prison; he must then have brought them out of prison. Where did he bring them to? Plainly, into his house: verse 32; "They spake unto him the word of the Lord,

and to all that were *in his house.*” But he says the house was in the prison. That is easier said than proved. But suppose it was; they were baptized neither in the prison nor the house. After the sermon, the jailer washed their stripes; and after this was done, the jailer and his household were baptized; and after the baptism, (verse 34,) “*he brought them into his house.*” They went somewhere out of both prison and house, to administer the baptism. When a Pedit-baptist minister wishes to baptize a household at home, does he take the family out of the house? When a Baptist minister wishes to baptize a household, what does he do? Just what the apostles did here; he goes out of the house to do it.

But he thinks that because Paul and Silas would not be *thrust out* of prison privily, they would not go out *privily* in the night to baptize the jailer and his family. Undoubtedly they would not. Paul and Silas would not have been guilty of any thing that had the least appearance of a stealthy disobedience to law or regular authority, though that authority had treated them unjustly. And had their preaching or baptizing in the night been an act of



this character, they would not have done it. They did not come out *privily*; but the jailer who was responsible for their safe keeping brought them out. They were still under his keeping, and he felt entirely safe that they would do nothing to render him liable to disgrace or punishment.

#### BAPTISM IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

That immersion was the practice of the church, in the age immediately succeeding the apostles, is as well substantiated as any other fact in Ecclesiastical history. I present the following as specimens of the manner in which the early Christian writers speak of it.

Hermas, who was cotemporary with Paul and whose name is mentioned by him in Rom. 16: 14, says: "The seal of the sons of God is water, *into which men descend* who are bound to death, but ascend out of it sealed to life." Augusti, after quoting the passage at length, says it "contains distinct evidence of the *custom of immersion.*"

Justin Martyr, who lived within fifty years of the time of the apostles, says: "Those who believe *are led to some place where there is*

*water, and there bathe in the water.*” In another place he says: “We represent our Lord’s sufferings and resurrection, by baptism *in a pool.*” Clemens Alexandrinus, who lived a little later, says: “You were led to a bath, as Christ was conveyed to the sepulchre, and were *thrice immersed*, to signify Christ’s three days’ burial.”

“Tertullian,” says President Sears, “makes no allusion to sprinkling, but expresses immersion by every Latin word that could be used.” As examples: “We are *immersed in water.*” “We are led *down into* the water and *dipped.*” “Peter immersed in the Tiber.” “It is indifferent whether one is baptized *in the sea, or in a pool, in a river or fountain, in a lake or channel.*”

Dr. Peters admits (p. 114,) that “there is evidence sufficient to show that, as early as the second century, immersion was *generally* practised;” but he adds, “it was not then claimed by any, as the *exclusive mode.*” But Mosheim and Neander, the two standard historians of the church, both affirm that in the two first centuries, baptism was *uniformly* administered by an immersion of the whole body in water. He says, (p. 115,) that “Origen

and Tertullian, who both lived within one hundred years of the apostolic age, testify to the practice and validity of baptism by affusion or sprinkling, and recommended it in cases, where, on account of sickness or other causes, immersion was inconvenient or dangerous. The same may be said of Clemens Alexandrinus, and Ireneus." He refers to Prof. Stuart as his authority for these statements. Now I am sorry to be obliged to call in question Dr. Peters' accuracy on a matter of fact, and that so simple as the reading of Prof. Stuart's essay, written in plain English. But I feel bound to say, that after a careful reading of that article, I find nothing of the kind said by him in reference to either Origen, Tertullian, Clement, or Ireneus. Prof. Stuart does not inform us of any intimation of sprinkling, by any Christian writer earlier than Cyprian, in the middle of the third century. He says that "Tertullian is the most ample witness of all the early writers," quotes numerous examples from him, all of the character I have adduced, and adds: "I do not see how any doubt can remain, that in Tertullian's time, the practice of the African church, to say the least, must have been *trine immersion*."

He then adds, "Subsequent ages make the general practice of the church still plainer, if indeed this can be done." Then follow quotations from Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine, Dyonisius, &c. He then says, "The passages which refer to immersion are so numerous in the fathers, that it would take a little volume merely to recite them." Then he gives another page of quotations, and concludes with the following emphatic language: "But enough. 'It is,' says Augusti, 'a thing made out,' viz. the ancient practice of immersion. So indeed all the writers who have thoroughly investigated this subject conclude. I know of no one usage of ancient times, which seems to be more clearly and certainly made out. I cannot see how it is possible for any candid man, who examines this subject, to deny this.

He adds, "That there were cases of exception allowed now and then, is no doubt true. Persons in extreme sickness or danger were allowed baptism by affusion. Cyprian pleads strongly and conclusively for this." He quotes four other authorities on this point, but *none earlier than Cyprian, the middle of the third century.* "But," he concludes, "all such cases were *manifestly* regarded as *ex-*

*ceptions* to the common usage of the church.” Summing up the whole matter, he says,— “From the earliest ages of which we have any account, subsequent to the apostolic age, and downward for several centuries, the churches did generally practise baptism by immersion; perhaps by *immersion of the whole person*; and the only exceptions to this mode which were usually allowed, were in cases of urgent *sickness*, or other cases of immediate and imminent danger, where immersion could not be practised. Aspersion and affusion, which in particular cases had been now and then practised in primitive times, were *gradually* introduced. These became at length quite common, and in the western church, almost universal, sometime before the Reformation.”

“In what manner, then,” he adds, “did the churches of Christ, from a very early period, to say the least, understand the word *baptizo* in the New Testament? Plainly they construed it as meaning *immersion*. They sometimes even went so far as to forbid any other method of administering the ordinance, cases of necessity and mercy only excepted.”

I have been full in these quotations from

Prof. Stuart, because they are to the point, and because he is a Massachusetts Congregationalist, whose reputation is world wide, for varied and extensive scholarship, and ardent devotion to biblical learning.

While I am on quotations, I cannot forbear adding the following from Dr. Wall, whom Dr. P. (p. 171,) ranks among "*our best historians.*" "The usual way of baptizing in the early ages, was by immersion, or dipping the person in water. This is so plain and clear, from an infinite number of passages, that *one cannot but pity the weak endeavors* of such Pedo-baptists as would maintain the negative of it. It is a great want of prudence as well as of honesty, to refuse to grant to an adversary what is certainly true, and can be proved so. It creates a jealousy of all the rest that one says." In another place he says: "We ought to disown and show a dislike of the profane scoffs which some people give to the English Anti-Pedo-baptists, (Baptists,) merely for their use of dipping. It is one thing to maintain that that circumstance is not absolutely necessary to the essence of baptism, and another to go about to represent it as *ridiculous* or *foolish*, or as *shameful* and

*indecent*, when it was, *in all probability*, the way by which our blessed Saviour, and *for certain* was the most usual and ordinary way, by which the ancient Christians did receive their baptism.”

The above extracts from Dr. Wall require no comment. The reflecting reader can ponder upon them and make his own applications.

Dr. P. says, (p. 116,) “ Our Baptist brethren are fond of claiming this history of the early practice of Christians as wholly in their favor. But if they take it as authority in respect to *immersion*, they ought to take the other things that I have named along with it,” (i. e., exorcism, unction, giving salt and milk to the candidate, clothing him in a snow-white robe, crowning with evergreen, and baptizing the candidate in a state of entire nudity.) Most certainly we ought, IF we took this history as AUTHORITY. We do not. THE BIBLE, *nothing more* and *nothing less* than THE BIBLE is our authority. Our question is, What does that word *baptize*, whose meaning contains the Saviour’s command, *mean*? We find, from an examination of that word, that by universal usage in all Greek literature

both classical and Jewish, up to the time when that command was given, it meant *immerse*. We find the New Testament baptisms to have been immersions; and here we feel authorized to say, the point is settled. We understand the law of baptism and apostolical practice, to require immersion. But as our brethren vehemently dispute us, we ask the early Christians immediately after the apostles, how they understand that law? and they unanimously cry IMMERSION. But we see those same Christians immersing *three times*. We inquire, Do you suppose the law requires that? No, responds Tertullian; “in being thrice immersed, (ter mergitamur) we fulfil *somewhat more* (amplius aliquid respondentes) than the Lord has decreed in the Gospel.” Then as to unction, exorcism, baptizing naked, &c., does the law require these? No, they respond, *tradition* is our only authority for these. Their testimony is explicit, that the law, as they understand it, requires simply *immersion*. So far, we hear them with confidence and respect. When they talk of “fulfilling somewhat more” than the law requires, on the authority of *tradition*, we demur.

But does not Dr. P. claim the practice of



early Christians in favor of sprinkling? (with how much reason I have shown.) Does not he quote Cyprian as justifying it? Why then does he not receive all these practices? These questions are pertinent; for it can be proved that contemporaneously with the introduction of these practices, (viz. exorcism, unction, &c.,) came the practice of sprinkling in extreme cases; (and I may add also infant baptism,) and nobody defends the validity of such baptism before Cyprian, in the middle of the third century, when these other practices were firmly established. Nor does Cyprian justify it except in those extreme cases; nor yet does he defend it either from the *law of baptism, or apostolical usage, or even tradition.* He defends it by such arguments as Dr. P. has given a specimen of; arguments *worthy* of Bishop Cyprian and his age, but *unworthy* of Dr. Peters and his age. It is then for Dr. P., and those who receive sprinkling, a practice having the same origin, and at the same time with exorcism, unction, and naked baptism, and who receive it on the same arguments by which Cyprian defended it, who at the same time defended all these other practices, to adopt and practice these ceremonies;

not for us, who abjure and renounce the whole together, and for the same reason—NOT ONE OF THEM HAS A THUS SAITH THE LORD FOR IT.

#### JEWISH PROSELYTE BAPTISM.

The careful reader of Dr. Peters' book cannot fail to see that he makes great dependence on the supposed existence among the Jews, before the coming of Christ, of a custom of baptizing the proselytes which they made from among the Gentiles. That supposed fact is the main pillar of his argument for infant baptism in Part II, although he studiously keeps it out of sight in Part I. His course of argument is this: When our Saviour gave the apostles the command to make disciples among all nations, baptizing them, they would interpret the command in conformity to the method of making disciples among the Jews, with which they were familiar; and that method was, as he alleges, when the head of a household became a disciple, (to Judaism,) to baptize him, and his household together; and accordingly the apostles would understand the commission to be, when they made a disciple to Christ of the head of a household,

that he and his household were to be baptized. The reader cannot fail to notice that this supposed fact is interwoven with the whole of Dr. P.'s reasoning on infant baptism; and if it is not a fact, there is but little left to his argument in Part II. Now for sake of the argument, I will for the present admit that the fact did exist as he supposes; and we will inquire a little more definitely what that would teach us in regard to Christian baptism.

Prof. Stuart, after an elaborate examination of the whole subject of Proselyte baptism, extending through seventeen octavo pages, concludes his examination as follows: "But what has all this to do with the question, What was the ancient mode of Christian baptism? Much; for *it is on all hands conceded*, that, so far as the testimony of the Rabbins can decide such a point, the baptism of proselytes among the Jews was by *immersion*.\* To cite authorities to this purpose is needless. They may be seen in Lightfoot, in Danz, and elsewhere. It is therefore a matter of no little interest, so far as our question is concerned, to inquire whether Christian baptism had its

---

\* Dr. Peters tacitly admits this on p. 51, though he is careful not to say it.

origin from the proselyte baptism among the Jews."

If, then, the apostles interpreted the commission to baptize from the Jewish proselyte baptism, the first thing that follows is, that they understood it to be *immersion*. It "is on all hands conceded," says Prof. Stuart.

So much it proves in regard to the "mode of baptism," and Dr. P. cannot escape it. He has planted himself on Jewish proselyte baptism, and that is precisely what it does for him.

Now, secondly, what does it prove in regard to the subjects of baptism? Prof. Stuart says, "when a proselyte was once baptized and received, this rite was at an end. His children born after his reception, were no more required to be baptized, than the children of native Jews." Pres. Sears states the same fact. If, then, the apostles understood the commission according to the Jewish proselyte baptism, when a parent was converted and baptized all the children would be baptized with him; but if he had children born *after* his baptism, they would not be baptized. If, for example, a parent at his conversion and baptism had one child, that one child would be

baptized; if he afterwards were to have ten more, the ten would not be entitled to baptism. Is that the Pede-baptist rite of infant baptism?

So much it proves in regard to the subjects of baptism, and Dr. P. cannot escape it. He has planted himself on Jewish proselyte baptism, and this is what it does for him. What less can be expected, when men forsake the plain directions of God's word, and give themselves up to fancies, conjectures, and empty traditions?

But admit that all that Dr. Peters supposes in regard to proselyte baptism is true—admit that it did exist as a regular Jewish usage before, and at the time the commission to baptize was given—admit also that it was in all respects analogous to the Pede-baptist rite of infant baptism—is Dr. Peters' argument even plausible? Dr. Peters admits that Jewish proselyte baptism was of men; (p. 51,) he also admits that John's baptism was from heaven. (p. 55.) He also admits that John's baptism was solely adult baptism. (p. 137.) Now if the apostles derived their conception of the baptism required in the commission from any baptism that had previously existed, would they not have been likely to have derived it from

John's baptism, with which they were familiar, which they had themselves received, and which they knew was from heaven, rather than from a Rabbinical custom, which they knew was from men, as utterly destitute of Divine authority as the Pharisaical traditions denounced by Christ? It is absurd enough to suppose that the Christian ordinance of baptism had its foundation on the legal institutions, that in so many places in the New Testament are declared to be superseded by the Christian dispensation; to found it on a mere Rabbinical custom, is the very climacteric of absurdity.

But it cannot be proved that any such institution as a Jewish proselyte baptism had any existence in the time of Christ. Prof. Stuart examines the whole subject, through seventeen octavo pages, and arrives at the conclusion that it "was practised, *at, or not long after the time when the second temple was destroyed.*" He examines all the authorities Dr. P. refers to, and shows that they entirely fail of proving it. President Sears (in *Chr. Rev.* vol. 3, p. 203,) says, "it is settled by the great critics of Germany, that the existence of proselyte baptism as a Jewish institution in the time of Christ cannot be proved." He

quotes Dr. Neander as saying in his lectures, "since the elaborate work of Schneckenburger has appeared, no one will pretend that he can prove the existence of a proselyte baptism in the time of Christ."

Dr. Peters can have his election between the two horns of this dilemma. He can maintain his stand on the Jewish proselyte baptism, in which case he loses the whole of his Part I, and still gets no infant baptism that will justify the practice of Pede-baptist churches. Or he can give it up, in which case he loses all of Part II, that is of any value to his argument.

Prof. Stuart (after Owen, Carpzov, and others,) thinks it not improbable that the Rabbins introduced proselyte baptism in imitation of the baptism of John. Since it is on all hands admitted that the Jewish proselyte baptism was immersion, if it is true that it was introduced in imitation of John's baptism, here is an irrefragible argument that John's baptism was immersion.

Again, since the Jewish proselyte baptism was immersion, if, as Prof. Stuart thinks, it was introduced about the time of the destruction of the second temple, which was during

the lifetime of the apostles, it will follow that the Jews in the time of the apostles understood the word *baptizo* to mean *immerse*. Is it not a just conclusion from this, that the apostles understood the word to mean immerse? Would they, being Jews, have been likely to use the word in a different sense from its current use among Jews in their time? And if this custom was in existence, in the time of Christ's ministry, as Dr. P. supposes, here would be an absolute demonstration that when the commission to baptize was given, that word was understood by the Jews to mean uniformly immerse.

Again, Dr. P. carries the idea through his whole first part, (though he nowhere proves it,) that the apostles took their notion of the outward form of the Christian ordinance of baptism, from the *sprinklings* of the Jewish law. But here we see Jewish Rabbins cotemporary with the apostles, familiar with all those sprinklings, and constantly using them, who yet when they introduce *baptism*, which they designate by the same word which the apostles employed to designate their ordinance, *always* administer it by immersion. Now if it is probable that the apostles would use



sprinkling for baptism, because they were familiar with Jewish sprinklings, it is vastly more probable that Jewish Rabbins would. And if the Jewish Rabbins did not, but used immersion, we may set it down as *certain* that the apostles would use immersion.

Again, Dr. P. maintains that Christian baptism is founded on the Jewish notion of purification; and because some of their purifications were effected by sprinkling, therefore Christian baptism is sprinkling. But it is proved by both Prof. Stuart and Pres. Sears, that the Jewish proselyte baptism was designed as a purification. Still it was performed by immersion. Can we have a clearer proof that immersion met the Jewish conception of purification in the time of Christ and the apostles, more nearly than sprinkling? and that if their conceptions of Christian baptism were founded on Jewish purifications, they would have been at once led to the practice of immersion? So that, if any argument in relation to Christian baptism can be founded on Jewish purifications, it would be that Christian baptism is immersion.

And lastly; if Jewish proselyte baptism were introduced about the time of the destruc-

tion of Jerusalem, it was introduced at the time when the New Testament was writing. It was uniformly immersion. Hence the Jews understood the word baptism to mean immersion. Just about this time, then, Mark, Luke and Paul were writing those texts, Mark 7: 4, Luke 11: 33, Heb. 9: 10, of which Dr. Peters makes so much in Sections 3 and 5 of Part I. Can stronger proof be given that the writers and readers of those texts understood those words to mean *immerse* and *immersion*? And if proselyte baptism had so early an origin as Dr. P. supposes, the proof is still stronger. Demonstration itself could not be stronger.

I commend this section to the careful attention of my Pede-baptist friends.

#### ALLEGED IMPRACTICABILITY OF IMMERSION.

Dr. P. tells us (on p. 126,) that immersion is not practicable in all climates. He specifies, under this head, cold climates, and perhaps he may also refer to desert countries, as Arabia, where, it is frequently urged, immersion is impracticable, for want of water. To the objection of cold climates, it is sufficient to say

that immersion is uniformly practised by the Oriental church, through every parallel of latitude, from the Frozen Ocean almost to the Equator. And what is *every day done*, may doubtless be considered *practicable*. And as to the deserts of Arabia, those who urge this objection doubtless forget that the Arab's camel frequently drinks at one time almost as much water as would suffice to plunge his master in.

He says, "If immersion were the only baptism, then God would require of *all believers* what *some believers* are unable to perform. Persons in delicate health, or converted in sickness and near to death, could not, on that supposition, profess Christ before men in the only appointed way." He thus lays down the principle that God would not require of *all believers*, what *any believer* in *some given circumstances* might be unable to perform. Now I suppose Dr P. will allow that the observance of the Lord's supper by believers is required by a law as imperative as that of baptism. And I presume he will allow that, so far as relates to the outward form of that ordinance, the eating of bread and the drinking of wine by the communicant is essential

to its observance. Christ requires this of *all believers*. But is it not obvious that cases may occur in which this is impracticable? May not persons be afflicted with particular forms of disease, in which the swallowing of any substance whatever, whether solid or liquid, is utterly impossible? Dr. P. has put the case of a certain woman who could not be immersed, and as she believed in no other baptism, she could not be baptized. I will put the case of another woman, who was in circumstances precisely similar in relation to the ordinance of the Lord's supper. In 1837, the wife of the well known Rev. John Leland, of Cheshire, died. The disease of which she died was a difficulty in her throat, which for some months previous to her death prevented her swallowing any thing but liquids. At length it became impossible for her to do this, and she literally *starved to death*. She was a woman eminent for piety, and as she was religiously attached to the ordinance of baptism, it may be presumed that she was equally so to that of the supper. But her observance of it was utterly impracticable. For months she could not obey that command. "And thus, for a long and dark period, she walked alone,

till God called her to his table above." Now God has indisputably "required of all believers" what this believer was indisputably "unable to perform." Nor is this case a solitary one. In attacks of quinsy, it not unfrequently occurs that the patient is unable to swallow any thing, solid or liquid. What then becomes of Dr. P.'s principle?

The truth is, when the law of Christ requires a definite physical act, (as it does in both the ordinances of the church,) and there is a physical impossibility of performing it, the law is *virtually obeyed*, and it is so accepted of God, when the desire is felt and expressed of performing it. God requires saints to assemble together on the Sabbath for public worship. And yet if there is a physical impossibility of any saint's doing it, while his heart is there, God accepts his desire as an actual performance. God accepted David's purpose to build the temple, and accounted it to him as if he really did it; and so he does the humblest saint in obeying the least of his commandments, when the external act is impossible. Such arguments as this of Dr. Peters may have weight with those who are so superstitiously wedded to outward forms,

that they would send for a minister in the dead of night to sprinkle a child, for fear it should die without baptism; but volumes of them would have little influence on those who have consistent views of the true relation of the believer to Christ's ordinances. I have no doubt that Dr. Peters' "woman" was a person of vastly more sense and piety than her son, who felt so confident that immersion does not belong to the gospel. She certainly exhibited more.

#### REMARKS ON PART II.

Dr. P. says, (p. 131,) "Of the 3,000,000 who profess religion in the United States, more than three quarters consider infant baptism as valid." If he includes Catholics and Unitarians, there are more than 3,000,000, and including those, probably the members of Pedo-baptist churches may be set down as about three-fourths of all church members. Omitting those, they are not more than two-thirds. And the one-third is rapidly gaining on the two.

But stating the aggregate of church members, is far from presenting the real facts in

the case. Multitudes of Pedit-baptist members have no more faith in infant baptism than Baptists have. It is a well known fact that in Congregational churches generally in New England, the article of infant baptism is a dead letter. I have been credibly informed that in some churches the article is suppressed or expunged; and it is well known that in all, members do as they choose about presenting their children for baptism. I know well a member of a church with which Dr. P. has some acquaintance, who united with it with that exception to the articles publicly expressed. I know another who lived for a long time without professing religion, because he had no faith in infant baptism; and the reason why he had not, was his witnessing a "household baptism" in the public congregation, when one of the "infants," a youngster of ten or twelve years, came rushing out of the church "swearing mad." Whether he thinks better of it now, I know not, but doubt. Methodist churches have still less uniformity. I have known their members to declare positively they believed in no baptism but immersion, and had no faith whatever in infant baptism. It is a fact too well known to be denied,

that the enforcement of the article of infant baptism in Pede-baptist churches would be the signal of disbanding.

The burden of Sect. 2, Part II, is, that in all the covenants of God with men, children are included with their parents. That this was so in the covenants with Noah, Abraham, &c., is freely admitted; that it is *not* so in the covenant of grace, I need only refer to Heb. 8: 10, the promise of which is, "I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts." All who are interested in that covenant will certainly be saved; and if children are included with parents in that, the children of believers are certain of salvation.

The precise point of the section, however, is, that when a believer makes a profession of religion, he makes formal covenant with God, and in that covenant his children are included. In a sense that is undoubtedly true; and in what sense? When a man dedicates himself to God, that dedication includes *all that is his*; his talents, his influence, his possessions, and his children too. And that dedication implies an obligation, so far as parental influence can go, to train up those children for God. Still those children are creatures of God, distinct



from their parents, and have an accountability separate from their parents. They have in infancy the germs of an understanding, will, and affections of their own; and as those faculties become developed, if they are truly joined to the Lord, they must make their own dedication. The dedication, therefore, which a parent makes of a child to God, is a qualified one; it is only so far his propriety in him, and his influence is concerned. Now is that dedication a reason for the baptism of the children? If it is, why is it not as good a reason for the baptism of all his possessions? Of his children, the dedication is necessarily qualified; of his possessions, it is absolute. If, therefore, the *qualified* dedication of children is a reason for their baptism, why is not the *unqualified* dedication of a fine horse, a reason for his baptism? or of a dairy of any number of cows? or of a flock of sheep? The reader sees that this is absurd; but it is a just conclusion from the argument. The simple truth is, the dedication of property to God implies certain duties with reference to that property; and so the dedication of children implies certain duties in reference to them. But it is no argument for their baptism. If God has

COMMANDED their baptism, do it, though ten thousand objections were brought against it; if not, you have no more right to baptize them, than you have to baptize your horse or your sheep.

But it is said (p. 160,) it is unreasonable to ask an express command for baptizing children. "Why," it is asked, "do those who raise this objection attend public worship from Sabbath to Sabbath, as a thing of religious obligation?" Because, first, it is expressly commanded: "Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together." Secondly, we have clear apostolical precedent. When either of these can be shown for infant baptism, we will receive it. "Why do they observe the first, instead of the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath?" Because we have apostolical precedent; just what we *want* for infant baptism. "Why do they administer the Lord's supper to females?" Because it is given to the *church* as such; and in Christ Jesus, there is neither male nor female. Show that infant baptism is given to the church, and we accept it. "Why do they pray with their children and families, or teach them to read?" By express command: "Bring them up in the

nurture and admonition of the Lord;" just such a command as we *have not* for infant baptism. Yes, show us command or example, and we yield at once.

In Section 3, it is attempted to be proved that the visible church is the same, under both the Jewish and Christian dispensations. Now here is a most remarkable fallacy. That God has had a spiritual people in all ages of the world, from Adam down, is unquestionably true; and the conditions of being one of God's spiritual people have ever been the same; viz., repentance, faith, obedience. The *invisible* church, then, has always been the same. But it will by no means follow, that the *visible* church has always been the same. It was one thing under the patriarchal dispensation, another under the legal, and another still under the Christian.

What is it that constitutes a visible church? Will the reader think of this question a moment? Is it that its members are visible men and women? But have we not reason to hope there may be many visible men and women, who are children of God, but who still are not members of the *visible* church? The visibility of the church, then, does not consist in

the visible corporeity of its members. Does it then consist in its being simply an organized body of Christians? But Dr. P. would not call the unbaptized members of a Methodist class, members of the visible church. But still they may be Christians, and are certainly an organized body. Turn this question over and over, and you can find nothing in which the visibility of the church consists, except that *it has* VISIBLE ORDINANCES. From this obvious truth it follows indisputably, that to establish an identity between the Jewish and the gospel churches, it must be shown that the VISIBLE ORDINANCES under both were the same; which surely no one will pretend.

The Jewish church the same with the gospel church! It was designed expressly, with all its ritual, as a TYPE of the spiritual church to be set up in the gospel day, with its spiritual facts and requirements. The type identical with the antitype! To call them so is confusion worse than the jargon of Babel. Nay, it was this very confusion which turned Christ's spiritual church into Babylon the Great; which converted the chaste virgin into the Mother of Harlots. The Jewish church was a national church, its membership hereditary. Its mem-

bers were born into it after the flesh; its ordinances were expressly called by the apostles, "carnal ordinances," and a "burthen which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear." The gospel church, on the other hand, is spiritual; holiness of heart is required of its members; its ordinances are few, simple, highly expressive, serving at once to give visibility to the body, and to set forth the great truths which lie at the very foundation of Christianity—the sufferings, death and resurrection of her great Redeemer.

Not less remarkable is the confusion which Dr. P. displays in applying the ancient prophecies. Such prophecies as "Arise, shine, for thy light *is* come, and the glory of the Lord *is risen upon thee*," he says were addressed by the prophets to *the church of their own time!* Did Isaiah, then, tell the church of his own time, that its light *was* come, and the glory of the Lord *had risen* upon it? Most clearly this is *not* addressed to the church of his own time, but to the church of the time when the prophecy should be fulfilled.

The same confusion is apparent in his application of New Testament scriptures. "Many shall come from the east and west, and shall

sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven." This, he says, was the visible church from which the Jews, for their unfaithfulness, should "be cast out." I answer, no; it is HEAVEN from which the Jews, for their rejection of Christ, should be excluded; "should be cast out into outer darkness," i. e., into hell, "where shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." The Jews were called the "children of the kingdom," i. e., of heaven, because the offer of salvation was first made to them. "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." Here it means, not the Jewish church, but the gospel church, which was set up among the Jews. The gospel was first preached to them, but the apostles, by the divine direction, told them, "Seeing ye judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo we turn to the Gentiles;" and thus was fulfilled this solemn declaration of our Lord.

In Section 6, under the head of "Testimony of early Christians" to infant baptism, (on p. 169,) occurs this remarkable passage: "Justin Martyr, who lived in the first half century after the death of the apostle John, says that

‘Infants are washed with water, in the name of the Father, and Son, and Spirit.’” Dr. P. has not told us on what authority he makes this extraordinary statement; and I do not hesitate to affirm that neither this declaration, nor any thing similar to it can be found in the writings of Justin. It is due both to Dr. Peters and the reader, that I state the reasons for this explicit contradiction of him, on a question of fact.

And first, being somewhat familiar with this controversy on both sides, I have never seen such a testimony as this produced from Justin, by any Pedo-baptist writer before Dr. Peters. Dr. Wall and Dr. Woods, who have both endeavored to make as strong a historical case as possible for infant baptism, have not cited this passage. Is it possible that so decisive a testimony as this, in favor of infant baptism, could have been given by a writer so near the apostles, and the world not have known it long ago?

Secondly, the very critical and thorough ecclesiastical historian, Neander, while he claims that Ireneus, in the very obscure passage referred to by Dr. P., makes an allusion to infant baptism, says expressly, “there is no

allusion to it before Ireneus." But Ireneus was later than Justin. Could such a testimony as this—so conclusive if it existed, have escaped the eagle eye of Neander, with whom such writers as Justin Martyr are as familiar as his own mother tongue?

Thirdly. In the year 1838, Pres. Sears, of Newton Theological Institution, published in the *Christian Review* (Vol. 3,) a very able and conclusive article, canvassing the historical evidence in favor of infant baptism. He there cites from Justin a decisive testimony *against* infant baptism. Prof. Emerson, of Andover, perceiving at a glance the important bearing that such a testimony from the earliest Christian father would have on this controversy, furnished for the same periodical a reply to Dr. Sears, (on that specific point only,) in which he endeavored, by an exegetical and philological argument, to invalidate that testimony of Justin's. This, of course, brought out Dr. Sears in a rejoinder, in which he demonstrated that the integrity of Justin's testimony against infant baptism remained unaffected by Prof. Emerson's philology; and then, by way of a *clencher*, he adduced another from Clement, of Alexandria, (who



lived later than Ireneus,) equally decisive against it. Now I say, if Justin had given such a testimony as Dr. Peters has cited *in favor* of infant baptism, Prof. Emerson, with all necessary facilities for examining Justin's writings at his hand, must have known it; and if he had known it, he could not have failed to have quoted it against Dr. Sears. For it would have been a most decisive answer to Dr. Sears's argument. I need not add that I have too much confidence in Dr. Sears's learning, to suppose that he would be *ignorant* of such a passage, if it existed; and in his candor to suppose that he would be silent in regard to it, if he knew of it. On the authority, then, of Prof. Emerson, of Andover, and Pres. Sears, of Newton, I express my belief that no such passage as Dr. P. has quoted from Justin Martyr can be found in his writings; and I say that in such a state of facts, the public, in the absence of any authority given for such a statement, have a right to refuse their credit to it, till the authority be given. And the most decisive authority will be the original Greek, of Justin, and a reference to the place where it can be found.

I will close these remarks upon Dr. P.'s ar-

guments for infant baptism with a single observation. The great discrepancy of views among Pedit-baptist writers, on the nature of the rite of infant baptism, and the evidence by which it should be sustained, is a great reason for doubts as to the propriety of practising it, and the validity of *any* of the arguments by which it is sustained. To say nothing of Catholics and Episcopalians, who make it regeneration, and who wish no better authority than that of the "Church" for it, the discrepancies among American Congregationalists and Presbyterians is remarkable. Within the memory of some now living and active, Dr. Worcester, of Salem, published a book on infant baptism, founding his argument on the Abrahamic covenant; Dr. Emmons followed him, with the declaration that such a mode of reasoning is entirely inconclusive—that New Testament ordinances must be supported by New Testament authority; Dr. Wilson, of Cincinnati, followed him with the declaration that the New Testament is *full* of proof for infant baptism; Dr. Woods, and Prof. Stuart follow after, the one affirming that "there is neither precept nor precedent for it in all our holy writings, and the proof must be made

out some other way,"—and the other, "Commands, or plain and certain examples in the New Testament, relative to it, I do not find." Dr. Bushnell, of Hartford, has set all Congregationaldom in a ferment, by declaring that infant baptism, as held by them, is only "a dead tradition, separated from any rational meaning or use"—that Congregationalists "are all Baptists in theory, which is the same as to say they ought to be in fact,"—and that a modified baptismal regeneration is the only rational or firm foundation for the rite; and lastly, Dr. Peters *tells us* he finds abundance of precept and abundance of example, both in the Old and New Testament, although he seems after all to have some misgivings in regard to the clearness of the proof they afford, for he says, "the demand for a text of scripture expressly commanding the baptism of children is unreasonable." Dr. Bushnell seems to feel painfully the force of these discrepancies. He says "that, there is something like a covenant in this matter, we all agree. But what it is, and what force it has, we have never agreed, and do not now. The Baptists have pushed us for an answer; we have given them *many answers*, but never

any single answer in which we could ourselves agree." Is it strange that "industrious ignorance" thinks it best to withhold its assent to infant baptism, at least till "learning" can agree with itself?

“ORIGIN OF THE BAPTISTS.”

Dr. Peters, in his last section, devotes two or three pages to the origin of the Baptist denomination. After affirming, on the authority of "our best historians," that no body of Christians were ever found who denied infant baptism before the 13th century, he asserts that the Baptist denomination, properly speaking, commenced in Germany in 1522, with the "*fanatical Anabaptists.*" Now I could say that all that Dr. P. states on those three pages is *false*, in as few words as he has that it is *true*. But as nothing would be gained by assertion and counter-assertion, I must beg the reader's attention to a few *authentic historical facts* on this subject. I will state them as briefly as possible.

Our distinctive sentiments on baptism are these two. First, that immersion is the only baptism authorized by scripture; and secondly,

that it is to be administered only on a profession of faith. As to the first of these points, I have already shown, from Prof. Stuart, that immersion was the sole practice in the age immediately succeeding the apostles—that in Cyprian's time, sprinkling was introduced for persons in sickness, or extreme danger. I will now quote from him in reference to the mode of baptism in succeeding ages.

“The mode of baptism by immersion, the Oriental church have always continued to preserve, even down to the present time. The members of this church are accustomed to call the members of the western churches *sprinkled Christians*, by way of ridicule and contempt.

“F. Brenner, a Roman Catholic writer, has recently published a learned work, which contains a copious history of usages in respect to the baptismal rite. The result of them, respecting the point before us, I present as follows:

“Thirteen hundred years was baptism generally and ordinarily performed by the immersion of a man under water; and only in extraordinary cases, was sprinkling or affusion permitted. These latter methods of bap-

tism were called in question, and even prohibited.'

“These results will serve to show what a Roman Catholic writer feels himself forced by historical facts to allow, in direct contradiction to the present practice of his own church; which nowhere practises immersion, except in the churches of Milan; it being every where else even forbidden.

“In the work of John Floyer on Cold Bathing, it is mentioned that the English church practised immersion down to the beginning of the 17th century, when a change to sprinkling gradually took place.” To this I will add that the English historians of the time of Henry VIII, describe minutely all the circumstances connected with the baptism of his two children, Edward and Elizabeth. (King Edward VI, and Queen Elizabeth.) They were both carried to church, and baptized publicly by a *trine immersion*. Dr. Wall, (one of “our best historians,” the reader will remember,) ascribes the change from immersion to sprinkling in England, to the Presbyterians of the time of Oliver Cromwell—chiefly to the Westminster assembly. He says somewhat tartly, “They who are in-

clined to Presbyterianism, are hardly prevailed to leave off that *scandalous custom* of having their children, though never so well, baptized out of a *basin* or *porringer*, in a bed chamber; hardly persuaded to bring them to church, much farther from having them dipped, though never so able to bear it." Dr. Wall, the reader will see, was a sturdy defender of the rubric of his own church, which to this day requires the priest "*to dip the child discreetly and warily,*" except its nurse testify that it is weakly, in which case he may "pour water" upon it. The "children of the church" at this day, are all "weakly."

The Edinburgh Encyclopedia says in reference to Scotland: "In this country, sprinkling was never used in ordinary cases till after the Reformation. During the persecution of Mary, many persons, most of whom were Scotsmen, fled from England to Geneva, and there greedily imbibed the opinions of that church. In 1556, a book was published at that place, containing 'The Forms of Prayer, and Ministration of the Sacraments, approved by the Famous and Godly learned man, John Calvin,' in which the administrator is enjoined to 'take water in his hand and lay it on the

child's forehead.' These Scottish exiles, who had renounced the authority of the Pope, implicitly acknowledged the authority of Calvin; and returning to their own country, with Knox at their head, established sprinkling in Scotland."

I have now given historical testimony sufficient to show that sprinkling, in the ordinary administration of baptism, is altogether of modern date; only about two hundred years old. And this, I trust, will be sufficient to justify our claim to antiquity, as regards the first part of our distinguishing sentiments.

I will now make some historical citations in respect to our views of the subjects of baptism. I shall show that there has been, from the earliest ages of the church, through all the darkness of Popery down to the Reformation, a succession of men, called by different names, who, through obloquy, reproach and bloody persecution, have maintained a constant testimony against infant baptism, as well as other corruptions of the truth. And in all these citations, the reader will remember that the persons described held to immersion, in common with all the rest of Christendom.

The first authentic mention of infant baptism



in the church, is by Cyprian, in the middle of the third century. It did not, however, become universal till nearly two centuries later. In the same century, (i. e., the third,) before infant baptism was received at Rome, Novatian, a Presbyter of that church, seceded from it on the ground of its departure from apostolical simplicity, and established a new sect, which was called *Cathari* or *Puritans*. There is the clearest evidence that these people opposed infant baptism.

We find these Puritans existing through several succeeding centuries, under different names, in different places; as, *Donatists*, *Luciferians*, and *Aerians*. Osiander says that modern Anabaptists are the same with the Donatists of old. Fuller, an English church historian, says that the English Baptists are the Donatists "*new dipped*." Augustine accuses the Luciferians of refusing to baptize infants.

In the seventh century, these people were called in Italy, Paulicians. In the eighth, they were called Paterines. They were charged by the Catholics, says Dr. Allix, "with abhorring baptism." Their answer was, "A strange will, a strange faith, and a

strange confession, do not seem to belong to a *little child*, who neither wills nor runs, and from whom *no confession of faith can be expected.*” They flourished in Milan for two hundred years, where they were protected by the rulers, and were called by the Catholics, Anabaptists.

In the eleventh century, appear two famous reformers in France, Bruno and Berengarius, whose heresies are described in a letter *still extant*, written by the Bishop of Leige to Henry I, of France. Among other things charged, he says, “As far as in them lies, *they do overthrow the baptism of infants.*”

In the twelfth century, we find a Catholic writer, by the name of Egbert, describing a numerous body of heretics, called Cathari, or Puritans, descendants, according to Mosheim, of the ancient Puritans (i. e., Novatians,) of Italy. This fact the reader will particularly notice. “They are,” says Egbert, “a sort of people very pernicious to the Catholic faith, because they maintain their opinions by authority of scripture”! Among other heresies, he says, “*they deny the utility of baptism to infants*, maintaining that baptism ought to be delayed till they come to years of discretion,

and even then, those only ought to be baptized who make a profession of faith and desire it." Egbert adds, "*They are increased to great multitudes throughout all countries.*" Evervinus, another Catholic priest of that time, describes these same people in a letter to St. Bernard, and represents them as very numerous. He says of them, "They do not hold to *the baptism of infants*, alleging, in proof of their doctrine, 'He that *believeth* and is baptized,' &c."

In the same century, Peter de Bruys and his followers, Henry and Arnold, appeared in France and Italy as zealous reformers. Mosheim says expressly of both Peter and Henry, that they *denied infant baptism*. St. Bernard writes of Henry to the Count of St. Giles as follows: "How great are the evils which we have heard and known to be done by Henry the heretic! He wanders up and down in your country, in sheep's clothing, being a ravenous wolf! The life of Christ is denied to infants, by refusing them the grace of baptism, nor are they suffered to draw near to salvation, though our Saviour tenderly cried out in their behalf, Suffer little children to

come unto me, and forbid them not! O most unhappy people!”


This is the “*small sect*” that Dr. P. speaks of as denying infant baptism because they held that *infants were incapable of salvation*. The reader can see what foundation there is for this calumny, which Dr. Peters, after his “best historians,” is laboring to fix upon those whom Mosheim *expressly* calls “the *witnesses of the truth* in the times of universal darkness and superstition.” Baptism with the Catholics was salvation. To deny baptism to infants, was, therefore, in their estimation, to deny salvation to them. To say that faith was a prerequisite to baptism, and that infants were incapable of faith, was to say that they were incapable of baptism; which in the mind of a Catholic, was to say they are incapable of salvation. The Catholics, therefore, fastened this calumny upon them. Dr. Wall, who writes his history for the purpose of defending infant baptism, eagerly catches up the calumny, to fasten odium upon those who deny infant baptism, and Dr. Peters as eagerly repeats it!

The Waldenses began to attract public attention in the twelfth century. Reinerius, a Popish inquisitor, and an apostate from the

Waldenses, wrote a work on these people. Among other reasons for their extermination as highly injurious to the Catholic faith, he gives these two—their antiquity, and their universal diffusion. From what he says of them, it is clear that they are the same with the Puritans, Donatists, Paulicians, Petrobrussians, and Henricans, who have already been shown to have opposed infant baptism. Mosheim says expressly of the Paulicians in France, in the eleventh century, that they rejected the baptism of infants. That all the Waldenses opposed infant baptism cannot be proved; that many of them did, is indisputably true. In the thirteenth century, we find the Bishop of Arles writing to Pope Innocent III, complaining that his diocese was troubled with a great many Waldensian heretics, who said *it was to no purpose to baptize children*. Cassanion, in his history of the Waldenses, says, “Some writers have affirmed that they approved not of the baptism of infants; and I cannot deny that *the greater part* were of that opinion.” Merringus affirms, on the authority of a confession of faith in his possession, that they were opposed to infant baptism.

Dr. Mosheim says that the origin of the

Dutch Baptists, (called in his day Anabaptists,) “ *is hid in the remote depths of antiquity.*” “They are not,” says he, “entirely mistaken, when they boast of their descent from the *Waldenses, Petrobrussians*, and other ancient sects, *who are usually considered as WITNESSES OF THE TRUTH*, in the times of universal darkness and superstition. Before the rise of Luther and Calvin, there lay concealed, in almost all the countries of Europe, many persons who adhered tenaciously to the following doctrine, which the Waldenses, and the followers of John Wickliffe, and John Huss, had maintained, viz. ‘That the kingdom of Christ, or the visible church he had established on earth, was an assembly of true and real saints, and ought, therefore, to be inaccessible to the wicked and unrighteous, and also exempt from all those institutions which human prudence suggests, to oppose the progress of iniquity, or to correct and reform transgressors.’” This proposition, I cannot help remarking, deserves to be printed in letters of gold. It was for maintaining this principle, that Roger Williams was banished from Massachusetts. It is a most admirable summary of the principles of church organi-

zation which the Baptists have ever maintained, and for maintaining which, they have met obloquy, reproach, stripes, imprisonment, banishment. It meets and cuts off every error in relation to church organization which all Pedo-baptist churches have at one time or other maintained—as the universal one of infant baptism—the partial ones of prelacy, hierarchies, union of church and state. It has achieved wonders, and it has yet greater wonders to achieve. And who held it? Let the reader mark it;  THE WALDENSES, and the followers of JOHN WICKLIFFE, and JOHN HUSS.

Dr. Mosheim further says that this maxim (which he calls a “fanatical principle,”) is the true source of all the peculiarities in the religious doctrine and discipline of the people whom he is describing. “It is in consequence of this,” says he, “*that they admit none to the sacrament of baptism, but persons that are come to the full use of their reason.*”

This statement of Dr. Mosheim’s needs no comment. The reader can see that he identifies the Dutch Baptists of his day with the Waldenses and the other ancient sects that opposed Popery—that he *expressly* identifies

the Waldenses with the Petrobrussians, who Dr. Peters admits opposed infant baptism—and that he identifies all the others mentioned with the followers of John Wickliffe and John Huss; and finally he ascribes to them all, the fanatical Roger Williams principle—**THE GREAT BAPTIST PRINCIPLE.**

The Waldenses spread themselves all over Europe. They abounded in England before the Reformation, and laid the foundation of many of the English Baptist churches. England, in the time of Cromwell, was full of Baptists. Their number and progress astonished all beholders. Many of them emigrated to this country, and laid the foundation of Baptist churches here.

Besides the evidence which I have given of a succession of men from the early corruptions of Christianity down to the present time, holding the essential points maintained by Baptist churches, a similar succession can be shown on the island of Great Britain. Christianity was introduced into Britain in the first century. In the fifth century, the Saxons, who were Pagans, conquered the island, and drove the original inhabitants into the mountains of Wales. At the close of the sixth



century, St. Austin was sent into England with forty monks, to convert the Saxons from Paganism to the religion of Rome. Such was their success, that they are said to have baptized 10,000 Saxons in one day, in the river Swale; another example of what can be done in the way of immersing. After he had converted the Saxons, his next attempt was to subject to his master, the Pope, the Welch Christians, who had never acknowledged Rome, or received any of her corruptions. He demanded of them three things; one of which was that they should “give *Christendome to their children.*” From this, it is clear that the ancient British, or Welch Christians, had never practised infant baptism; and the advent of St. Austin was the introduction of that and Popery, at once, into that island. These Christians had the temerity to refuse both “Christendome for their children,” and Popery from St. Austin; for which crime his saintship set upon them the murderous arms of the Saxons, who slaughtered without mercy great numbers of them. Since that time, Wales has never been without witnesses for the truth. Baptist churches have always flourished there, very similar in doctrine and discipline to those

at present existing. In 1663, an entire church, with their pastor, emigrated from Swansea, in Wales, and settled the town of the same name in Massachusetts.

I have not presented this historical sketch because it is of the least importance as to the real issue between us and our Pedo-baptist brethren. If it were true that not a Baptist ever existed, from the time of the death of the apostle John up to this present year, 1848, yet if Baptist principles are scriptural, all Christians ought to receive them. Still the fact that almost every Pedo-baptist book, or sermon on baptism, makes the grand climacteric of the argument, the assertion that Baptists never had any existence before the mad men of Munster appeared, in the sixteenth century, seems to require some notice; and I do not see how less can be done than to make a statement of the real facts in the case. If "I am become a fool in glorying," I can say to our brethren, "Ye have compelled me."

#### CONCLUSION.

In taking my leave of Dr. Peters' book, I wish to address a word to any of my Pedo-

baptist friends who may have thought it worth their while to follow me through these pages. Baptism is declared by the Holy Ghost to be "*the answer of a good conscience toward God.*" Now a good conscience, in relation to any religious duty, implies a correct understanding of that duty. And a correct understanding implies a fair examination. Has the subject of baptism ever received a candid examination at your hands? Hearing your pastor preach upon it, is not an examination of it; reading Dr. Peters's book, or mine, or both, is not an examination of it. All this is well, but action on this alone will not be entitled to be called the answer of a good conscience toward God. Reading the word of God even, is not an examination of it, if you read with a determination not to sacrifice your preconceived opinions and prejudices. Hear our Saviour: "If any man WILL DO his will, he shall KNOW of the doctrine." It is only by coming to the word of God with a prayerful spirit, and with a firm purpose to do the duty you may find taught there, that you can hope to learn what duty is. Have you ever done this? If not, can *your* baptism be, in any sense whatever, the answer of a good conscience toward God?

Can you be said to have *any conscience at all* in relation to it?

I make these suggestions in a spirit of brotherly kindness. And I trust I shall be pardoned for saying, they are worthy of your serious attention. Baptism is a command of our blessed Saviour—of Him who has said, “If ye love me, **KEEP** my commandments.” “He that hath my commandments and **KEEPETH** them, he it is that loveth me. He that loveth me not, **KEEPETH NOT** my sayings.” “Whosoever shall break one of these **LEAST COMMANDMENTS**, and shall teach men so, he shall be called **THE LEAST IN THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.**”

---

**NOTE.**—In the preceding pages the author has given but a brief space to Dr. Peters' Part II. When he undertook this review he had already prepared for the press a treatise containing a concise, but complete examination of the whole subject of infant baptism, including a full exposition of the covenant of circumcision, and an examination of all the historical arguments usually advanced in support of infant baptism. He flatters himself, that in these two particulars, his forthcoming tract will be found more full and satisfactory, than any work now in general circulation, on the Baptist side of this question.







